

Only Decatur House, at the corner of Jackson Place and H Street has been exempted from the march of progress. All the other buildings, with the possible exception of 700 Jackson Place, are slated to be torn down or merged into a new Federal office building to take 3,250 overflow employees from the bulging executive offices.

The new office building will complete the transition of Jackson Place from its early role as a center of Washington's social and intellectual life. Once called 16½ Street, and then Lafayette Square West, it owes its present name to the equestrian statue of President Andrew Jackson, which stands in the center of Lafayette Park, on which Jackson Place faces.

THE YARD WAS TOO BIG

Back in 1801 a brick kiln and an old market stood in what is now the park. It had been intended that this piece of ground, once an apple orchard, would be part of the White House grounds. But Thomas Jefferson separated what is now the park from the White House property, saying: "It made too large and ostentatious a front yard."

Decatur House, oldest and finest of the Jackson Place residences, was built in 1819 for the intrepid Commodore Stephen Decatur. He paid for it with part of the prize money he drew for captures of enemy ships. He lived in the house less than 2 years before he was fatally wounded in a duel with Capt. James Barron and brought home to die in 1820.

After the commodore's death, the house was occupied by Baron Tuyll, the Minister from Russia; Henry Clay, Martin Van Buren, Edward Livingston, and foreign ministers Sir Charles Vaughan and Baron Hyde de Neuville and others. It was purchased after the Civil War by Gen. E. F. Beale and remained in the Beale family until 1956, when, by the will of Marie Beale, it went to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The side yard of Decatur House was purchased by Robert S. Brookings, and a large building, now the home of the National Grange, was erected there. Putting the building there cut off the view of the White House from a second-floor window of the Decatur House which Martin Van Buren had cut in the wall so he might exchange signals with his close friend President Jackson.

The large house next to the Grange building, No. 736, was first occupied by William F. Marcy, Secretary of War for President James K. Polk and Secretary of State for President Pierce. James G. Blaine lived there and it was also occupied by President Theodore Roosevelt during the summer of 1902 while the White House was being renovated. The Women's City Club and the National Lutheran Council later used the premises.

No. 734 was for many years the home of Charles C. Glover, Washington banker. Secretary of the Navy R. W. Thompson also lived there while in the Cabinet of President

Hayes, and for many years it served as the office of the Christian Science Parent Church. It is now mainly used by the publications division of the Brookings Institution.

The fine old brownstone house, No. 730, is now occupied by the United States Conference of Mayors. The unusual hand-carved walnut fireplaces and other woodwork in this house have been carefully preserved. It was once the home of the editor, William J. Murtagh, who established the newspaper, the National Republican, and of Gen. Frank Steele.

SICKLES PROVIDED SCANDAL

The main building of the Brookings Institution, at 722 Jackson Place, stands on the site of the home of Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, who provided Washington with more excitement over a longer period of time than almost any other resident. While serving in Congress as a Representative from New York, General Sickles found good reason to suspect Philip Barton Key, United States attorney for the District of Columbia, of "flirting with his wife." General Sickles armed himself with a revolver and two derringers, then met the unarmed Mr. Key near the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Place, at the east end of the park.

Shouting, "You have dishonored my home and my family," the general shot Mr. Key three times with the revolver and would have shot him a fourth time as he lay on the ground, but the cap failed to fire. General Sickles was acquitted, became a Civil War general, lost a leg at Gettysburg, then returned to Congress, where he served with distinction.

The United Automobile Workers' Union now occupies the new building at 718 Jackson Place. Here once stood the home of Mrs. Violet Blair Janin. Mrs. Janin, born in Blair House, was well known as a linguist and, on meeting visiting diplomats at Washington social gatherings, astounded many of them by conversing in their own languages.

In order to have a Washington headquarters while the National Art Gallery was under construction, the two houses at 716 and 712 Jackson Place were purchased for the use of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust. These houses, now restored and modernized, were once the homes of a number of distinguished Washingtonians, including Senator Arthur P. Gorman, and Col. Henry R. Rathbone, who accompanied President and Mrs. Lincoln to Ford's Theater on the tragic night of April 14, 1865. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is now located in No. 712.

Col. William L. Phillips, John R. McLean, and a Mrs. Green, daughter of Admiral Dahlgren, were occupants of No. 708 which was acquired by the United States Government some time ago.

MINISTER TO CHINA ON CORNER

One of the first residents of the big corner house, No. 700, was Peter Parker, Minister to China. Franklin A. Dick, lawyer and partner

of Montgomery Blair, owned and lived in No. 704. Both these houses became the office of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace until this branch of the organization moved to New York and the property was sold to the Government.

It has taken the Government a long generation to move in on Jackson Place. The Charles C. Glover family sold their splendid townhouse at No. 734 in the midnineties because of a rumor that the Government would soon take over. When buying property on Jackson Place, Mr. Brookings commented that "it is the finest location in Washington." Apparently the representatives of the Government have finally decided Mr. Brookings was right.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.

Re Buildings of historic value.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: You have asked to be informed as to the procedures developed for the purpose of establishing the authenticity of federally owned properties that may have historical value. The following procedures for the referral and review of obsolete Federal buildings scheduled for demolition have been developed jointly by the National Park Service and GSA:

1. GSA will notify the National Park Service of the proposed demolition of an existing Federal building at the time GSA includes a project for its replacement in its lease-purchase or other construction programs. The notification will be in memorandum form which will give the name of the building, its location, and its date of construction; a separate memorandum will be forwarded on each project.

2. The National Park Service, upon receipt of the memorandum of notification, will examine the project file in the GSA's Washington Office; and, if necessary, borrow pertinent documents, maps, and photographs for study.

3. After preliminary study, if the National Park Service finds no apparent historical value in the property, GSA will be notified to this effect. If definite historical value is believed to exist and field investigation is required, GSA will also be notified and provided with a statement of the probable time required for the report and determination as to the national historical significance of the structure.

4. The National Park Service will provide GSA with a written determination on the historical significance of the structure within a feasible time and if possible, within a 60-day review period.

These procedures are now in effect, and the National Park Service has already cleared five obsolete buildings which have been scheduled for demolition.

Sincerely yours,

F. MORAN MCCONNIE,

Commissioner of Public Buildings.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1957

(Legislative day of Monday, February 18, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God and Father of mankind, in whose will is our peace, in whose love is our rest, in whose service is our joy: grant us Thy empowering to work into the colorful tapestry of life we are daily

weaving, in our character, and in our deeds, the radiant qualities of the divine; so that, as the flowers of the earth put on garments of gold and crimson and purple through their partnership with light, our spirits may become as the garden of the Lord, clothed with the bright blossoms of faith and peace through their union with Thee, who art light and in whom is no darkness at all. With our eyes upon that sun of righteousness which no earth-born clouds can dim, we lift our gaze from the valley of seeming futility and despair to the hills of eternal verities which stab the horizon with great and glorious spires. In the strength of that beckoning vision,

make us strong to endure, that we faint not nor fear. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 19, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, obligation of Federal funds, Federal civil defense, for quarter ended December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the period July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the General Counsel, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, JUNIPER DIVISION, WAPINITIA PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an

adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Juniper division, Wapinitia project, Oregon, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF CERTAIN SECURITY PROVISIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONTRACT NO. AT (30-3)-222

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of Atomic Energy Commission contract No. AT (30-3)-222 with Yankee Atomic Electric Co., dated November 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., relating to the construction of facilities for the development of power on the Niagara River; to the Committee on Public Works.

FLOOD CONTROL—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution of the Senate of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the Congress of the United States to act with respect to flood control in that State. I may say the resolution comes after disastrous floods in the southern part of the State. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, together with the certificate of the Honorable D. Pitt O'Brien, Secretary of State of West Virginia, transmitted with the resolution, and my letter, in reply to Mr. O'Brien, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution, certificate, and letter were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

Memorializing Congress to take action on flood control embracing the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in West Virginia.

Whereas the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River in the State of West Virginia has recently been visited by a flood disaster, which might have been averted to

a marked degree by a proper system of flood control; and

Whereas the recent flood has caused damage to the extent of at least \$10 million in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and

Whereas, other floods have occurred at great frequency during the past few years in said valley, resulting in damages to the extent of many millions of dollars; and

Whereas, the distressing conditions due to floods tell a more powerful story than any that might be calculated in terms of the cost of a proper flood control system: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River; and be it

Resolved further, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the legislature on February 7, 1957, according to the official records in my office.

J. HOWARD MYERS,

Clerk, Senate of West Virginia.

I, D. Pitt O'Brien, secretary of state of the State of West Virginia, hereby certify that the annexed and hereto attached is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, regular session, on the 7th day of February, 1957, as appears from the records of my said office.

Giver under my hand and the great seal of the said State at the city of Charleston, this 12th day of February 1957.

D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

FEBRUARY 19, 1957.

Hon. D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State,
State of West Virginia,
Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received the certificate which you sent me containing Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9, in which the Congress of the United States is requested to take such action as will provide a suitable and proper system of flood control in order to avert another such disaster in the valley of the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River. Be assured that I am in full accord with the purpose of this resolution. In keeping with the views expressed therein, I have already taken steps which I hope will bring about a realization of more flood control in our State.

I have requested the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army to proceed promptly with plans for flood control requirements on the Big Sandy River and its tributaries including Tug Fork of that river. This authority is already vested in the Corps of Engineers with respect to this river.

Further, I have prepared a resolution for action thereon by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate directing the Corps of Engineers to bring up to date its survey and plans for the Guyandotte River and its tributaries.

Request has also been made of the Army Corps of Engineers to complete as quickly as possible its plans and proceed with construction of the flood control project at Williamson under Public Law 685.

I shall be very pleased if you would convey my response to the Senate of West Virginia

and advise the senate that I shall do all I can to establish more flood control where most needed in our State.

Very truly yours,

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB.

CONTROL OF GRASSHOPPERS— JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Joint Memorial No. 1, adopted by the Montana Legislature now in session. The memorial deals with the need for an adjustment in the cooperative program to fight infestation and control of grasshopper outbreaks on range and grazing lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable LeRoy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; relating to infestation and the control of grasshopper outbreaks on range and grazing lands

Whereas grasshoppers constitute a threat to range and grazing lands each year, with the intensity and scope of infestation varying from as much as 380,000 to 7,500,000 acres from 1 year to the next and from less than 100,000 to 2,000,000 acres in a similar period with no particular pattern of infestation evident in any succession of years nor any relationship between geographic areas or intensity within a given infestation that can be used as a basis for prediction; and

Whereas during the years of low grasshopper populations, infestations are confined to relatively small acreages which can be handled by the landowners themselves. In years of widespread outbreaks each individual infestation, which taken together constitute an outbreak, is so large that the total holdings of several farmers or ranchers may be involved. With the large acreage involved, which is usually accompanied by low precipitation and consequent lower yields, an economic situation is created whereby the landowner cannot combat the problem with his own resources; and

Whereas by administrative decision the present Federal-State cooperative program authorized under Public Resolution No. 91 of the 75th Congress is based on the theory of outbreak prevention and on the concept that outbreaks can be predicted from existing infestations and that all grasshopper infestations spread to adjoining areas from existing infestations; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that infestations develop through unpredictable changes in conditions existing in the areas so infested; and

Whereas comprehensive research has shown that the extent of damage done is not necessarily a result of the number of grasshoppers present, but appears to be related to the species of grasshopper present and the growing conditions of the plants, making it

impossible to predict damage prior to its onset following the hatch of grasshoppers; and

Whereas hatching dates differ so widely from one area to another, even within the same species, that damage may be severe in one area before it appears in another; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions upon which the Federal-State cooperative program is based do not consider the problems posed by populations of those grasshopper species which infest nor the added problem of acres diverted to the soil bank which could become breeding grounds for the migratory species; and

Whereas the present administrative decisions allow only a 33 1/3 percent Federal participation in the cost of control on privately owned lands which is inadequate to bring the cost down to a level that can be economically borne by the landowner under widespread outbreak conditions; and

Whereas the administrative decisions under which the present Federal-State program operate are so rigid that the program cannot be effectively adapted to the unpredictable situations which occur from year to year and its objectives of control from the standpoint of outbreak and migration prevention are not only inconsistent with research findings, but do not allow for the most effective use of available moneys at a time and in such places that the landowners can derive the maximum benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully recommend and urge the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from Montana and the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture to secure the reconsideration and revision of the administrative decisions upon which the present Federal-State cooperative program is based to the end that it will better serve the needs of range landowners and provide an adequate and fairly administered program of rangeland protection; be it further

Resolved, That consideration be given to conducting cooperative Federal-State control programs on the basis of rangeland protection rather than outbreak prevention and that the rancher-farmer be given the opportunity to elect when, where, and by whom the work shall be done; that the Agriculture Department of the State of Montana, in conjunction with the United States Soil Conservation offices, cooperate in the work and administration necessary to attain the objectives contained in this program; be it further

Resolved, That Federal moneys be made available to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of control on a matching basis regardless of the source of the matching money; be it further

Resolved, That the program be administered to the end that everyone participating in grasshopper control receives his proportionate share of the public moneys available regardless of their source; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable LeRoy Anderson, Representatives from the State of Montana and to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

PAUL CANNON,

President of the senate.

EUGENE H. MAHONY,

Speaker of the house.

CHAPLAINS' DAY—RESOLUTION OF LAS VEGAS (NEV.) FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Las Vegas Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Las Vegas, Nev., on January 22, 1957, which is entitled "Chaplains' Day Resolution."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPLAINS' DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas on February 3, 1943, the U. S. S. *Dorchester* was sunk in the North Atlantic, during World War II, with the loss of more than 600 American lives, including 4 chaplains of 3 great religious faiths; George L. Fox, Protestant; John P. Washington, Catholic; Alexander L. Goode, Jewish rabbi, and Clark V. Poling, Protestant minister; and

Whereas these four chaplains gave up their lives that others might live, going down together on the deck of the U. S. S. *Dorchester*, to give to the world for all time a dramatic example of human brotherhood, courage, and selflessness, and an inspiring demonstration of interfaith unity and understanding; and

Whereas in order that the meaning and significance of their heroic deed may be perpetuated each year, memorializing not only the supreme sacrifice of the four chaplains, but the supreme sacrifice of all chaplains who gave up their lives for others, inspiring all Americans by their example of faith and courage: Now therefore be it

*Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to set aside the first Sunday in February each year, as Chaplains' Day, and that the day be devoted to the dedicated memory of the four chaplains of the U. S. S. *Dorchester* and all chaplains who gave their lives for our country.*

Above resolution adopted by Las Vegas Aerie, 1213, Fraternal Order of Eagles, on January 22, 1957.

CHESTER COBAIN,
Worthy President.
A. G. BLAD,
Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 348. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States (Rept. No. 93).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1292. A bill to reduce loss of life, personal injuries, and property damage resulting from automobile accidents by establishing an Automobile and Highway Safety Division within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to work in cooperation with other public and private agencies for

such purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 1293. A bill for the relief of Eithanlahu (Eton) Yellin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Viguera Pinar; and

S. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1296. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1297. A bill for the relief of Walter Wettshreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HENNING, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEHR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. AIKEN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. IVES, Mr. THYE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S. 1298. A bill to assist States in providing needed vocational education of less than college grade in essential occupations, including retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments, through establishment and maintenance of area vocational school programs providing vocational training and retraining for persons residing in the State or area, including related instruction for apprentices; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1299. A bill for the relief of Irma Kurrle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1300. A bill to authorize John R. Quigley to construct and maintain a sign, 50 feet by 30 feet, on certain property of the United States in Montana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1301. A bill for the relief of Sam A. Reeks, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1302. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1303. A bill for the relief of the cities of Mandan and Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1304. A bill to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1305. A bill for the relief of certain members of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Pao-Wei Yung; and

S. 1307. A bill for the relief of Toribia Basterrechea (Arrola); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1308. A bill for the relief of Carmen Jeanne Launols Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1309. A bill for the relief of Susanne Burka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1310. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; and

S. 1311. A bill for the relief of Maria Gradi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1312. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Brown and Frances Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1313. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1314. A bill to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1315. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 1316. A bill to reduce the percentage depletion for oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1317. A bill for the relief of Herman Sung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to implement the Convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for the disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION BY TARIFF COMMISSION OF EFFECT OF IMPORTATION OF FURS

Mr. MCCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 100), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as

amended, to make a thorough investigation of the effect upon the American fur-producing industry of the importation of furs, and to report thereon to the Congress on or before November 1, 1957.

SEC. 2. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing is given to interested parties. The report of the Commission shall set forth the facts affecting the relative competitive position of foreign and domestic fur producers, including the impact of trade practices, methods of distribution, and imports on domestic producers, and shall take into account reports that foreign furs are being dumped on the American market.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AUTOMOBILE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss briefly a problem which can best be described as a continuing national catastrophe. It is a problem with which we live every day of our lives, but which rarely intrudes into our conscious thoughts. It is a problem of life and death, and its very familiarity has bred either contempt or indifference.

Occasionally we see statistics which tell us that a killer is loose in our country. Between 1947 and 1955, it slaughtered 320,000 Americans. More than 38,000 died in 1955 alone, and another 110,000 were permanently crippled. In half a century, this killer has taken more than twice as many American lives as all our wars. The property damage has run into the billions of dollars, and there is no measure of the agony and privation that have been caused.

I am referring to the deadly toll of highway accidents.

It is not a simple problem, because we live in a nation that is committed to the automobile as a way of life. For every 3 people in America today, there is 1 automobile. Sixty-five percent of our families own a car. There are 66 million licensed drivers.

Retail motorcar and truck sales amount to more than \$30 billion yearly. In Detroit alone, half a million workers are employed by the automobile industry.

The automobile has transformed our whole society. It has given us mobility, employment, and a new measure of freedom. It has also given us death on an unprecedented scale.

We cannot abolish the automobile, but neither can we ignore the problems that it brings to us. There is a responsibility here which we must face.

I am introducing today a bill to establish an Automobile and Highway Safety Division in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is a clear-cut role which such a division can play.

It can collect information; it can work with State and local governments; it can cooperate with such organizations as the Cornell study group and the National Safety Council; it can promote research into improved designs for automobiles and highways to prevent accidents and to reduce the severity of injuries in automobile accidents.

It can constantly bring to the public's attention the facts of life and death in highway safety. It can inform the public on the currently known and proven measures which will increase highway safety.

Mr. President, it is my hope that this step will make a positive contribution to solving a problem that has caused death, destruction, and untold agony on an unprecedented scale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1292) to reduce loss of life, personal injuries, and property damage resulting from automobile accidents by establishing an Automobile and Highway Safety Division within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to work in cooperation with other public and private agencies for such purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators HRUSKA, CARLSON, GOLDWATER, BARRETT, YOUNG, and MCCARTHY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the requirement that 25 percent of funds made available for loans to Rural Electrification systems shall be apportioned to States in the proportion that the number of nonelectrified farms in a State bears to the national total of nonelectrified farms.

As is well known, the provision for allocating this portion of the funds appropriated annually was reduced to 25 percent by a law enacted in 1955. At that time, hearings on the amendment made it clear that, with about 95 percent of our farms now electrified, the allocation serves no useful purpose. During the 1955 hearings, REA representatives and testimony of farm organizations sought repeal of the allocation.

This proposed legislation will benefit our fine REA program, and obviate a cumbersome procedure. In addition, it will serve the interest of economy in government, in that allocation of funds to a State will not guarantee that the funds will be used in that State. Loans can be made only if valid applications are submitted. It has frequently been necessary for the Rural Electrification Administration to draw down funds far in excess of the amount needed for a particular loan because of the allocation formula.

For many years, there has been sincere effort to abandon the allocation formula, and I believe that we can, by avoiding it, be of service to our REA systems. We all know of the importance of sound REA development for farms and farm homes. I am sure we are all interested in giving our REA program this added help.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1296) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, introduced

by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1957

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators FULBRIGHT, SPARKMAN, TALMADGE, JACKSON, HENNINGS, CARLSON, COOPER, HUMPHREY, KERR, LANGER, MONRONEY, MORSE, PASTORE, MURRAY, SCOTT, ERVIN, MANSFIELD, CHAVEZ, AIKEN, SMITH of Maine, IVES, THYE, PAYNE, YOUNG, MAGNUSON, CHURCH, O'MAHONEY, CARROLL, SYMINGTON, KEFAUVER, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, CLARK, MCCLELLAN, WILEY, KENNEDY, POTTER, NEUBERGER, JAVITS, and McNAMARA, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist States in providing needed vocational education of less than college grade in essential occupations, including retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments, through establishment and maintenance of area vocational school programs providing vocational training and retraining for persons residing in the State or area, including related instruction for apprentices. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1298) to assist States in providing needed vocational education of less than college grade in essential occupations, including retraining made necessary by scientific and technological developments, through establishment and maintenance of area vocational school programs providing vocational training and retraining for persons residing in the State or area, including related instruction for apprentices, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

The primary purpose of the measure is to assist States in the further development of vocational training in essential occupations for youths, adults, and older persons, residing in areas not now being adequately served. It would be especially helpful to States in providing training and retraining made necessary by new scientific and technological developments and relocation of industries.

If enacted into law, this measure will help our Nation to win the economic war with Russia, which is beginning to take form. The future of America is tied inseparably to the skills and productivity of the masses.

This proposed legislation will encourage States and local communities to develop vocational programs of less than college grade in keeping with local, State, and National needs. A recent survey shows that virtually every State is now operating one or more area vocational education programs. Federal funds would help stimulate the further development of this vital program and thus greatly strengthen our Nation.

The bill, if enacted, would authorize appropriations as follows: \$5 million for the 1st year; \$7,500,000 for the 2d year; \$10 million for the 3d year and such amount for each fiscal year thereafter as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act. It contains provisions for minimum amounts for States with small populations. It also authorizes an appropriation of \$500,000 for State supervision of industrial arts education. The measure provides for allotting funds to States on a composite of the formula used in the George-Barden Vocational Education Act. This formula has proved satisfactory for more than 20 years.

Funds appropriated under the provisions of the measure would, after the first year, be matched by State or local funds or both—75 percent of the funds must be matched the 2d and 3d years and 100 percent thereafter. Funds may be used for determining need, planning, developing, and operating area vocational education programs, including among other things, salaries and necessary travel expenses of personnel; purchase, rental or other acquisition, and maintenance and repair of instructional equipment; and purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids.

To receive benefits under the measure a State board for vocational education may submit to Federal authorities a separate State plan or an amendment to its present State plan for vocational education. The program at the State level will be under the supervision and control of the State board for vocational education. It will be administered at the national level by the United States Commissioner of Education under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As defined in this measure, "the term 'area vocational school program' means a program of a tax-supported school operated by State or local public school authorities consisting of one or more less-than-college-grade courses of vocational training and related instruction (including related instruction for apprentices) on an organized, systematic class basis, made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least 16 years of age and can profit by instruction offered."

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT, RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX, AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MURRAY, NEELY, KENNEDY, NEUBERGER, COOPER, and BEALL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill containing a group of railroad retirement and unemployment insurance amendments to existing legislation.

Congress has an unfinished job and an unfulfilled obligation to discharge—the enactment of railroad-retirement legislation. Toward the close of the last Congress I called on Congress to do that by deciding upon the final plan of a bill for railroad-retirement amendments and then to enact that bill.

Unfortunately that was not done. We in the 85th Congress must do the job, without dragging our feet, in order to do justice to retired railroaders and their survivors and those who are working toward retirement. We have the duty to them and the community at large to

keep up to date the retirement purchasing power of the people who make our railroads run.

Toward that end I am introducing a bill to improve the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. It is a companion to H. R. 4101 recently introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As chairman of the subcommittee on railroad retirement I shall do everything that I can to insure that this bill, and any others on the subject, receive prompt and thorough consideration so that a fair and workable bill will come before the Senate. To that end I plan hearings for the week of March 11. The exact dates will be announced soon.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a brief analysis of its provisions, may be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill lie on the table for the remainder of this week, for the addition of the names of other cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1313) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 2 (a) 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"3. Individuals who will have attained the age of 60 and will have completed 30 years of service or, in the case of women, who will have attained the age of 62 and will have completed less than 30 years of service, but the annuity of such individual shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that he or she is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

(b) Section 2 (d) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If, pursuant to the third sentence of this subsection, an annuity was not paid to an individual with respect to 1 or more months in any calendar year, and it is subsequently established that the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year as determined in accordance with that sentence (but exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) did not exceed \$1,200, the annuity with respect to such month or months, and any deduction imposed by reason of the failure to report earnings for such month or months under the fifth sentence of this subsection, shall then be payable. If the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year (exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) is in excess of \$1,200, the number of months in such year with respect to which an annuity is not payable by reason of such third and fifth sentences shall not exceed 1 month for each

\$100 of such excess, treating the last \$50 or more of such excess as \$100; and if the amount of the annuity has changed during such year, any payments of annuity which become payable solely by reason of the limitation contained in this sentence shall be made first with respect to the month or months for which the annuity is larger."

(c) Section 2 (e) of such act is amended by striking out "than an amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "than 110 percent of an amount."

(d) Section 2 (g) of such act is amended by inserting after "wife under age 65" the following: "(other than a wife who is receiving such annuity by reason of an election under subsection (h))."

(e) Section 2 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) A spouse who would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (e) if she or he had attained the age of 65 may elect upon or after attaining the age of 62 to receive such annuity, but the annuity in any such case shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that the spouse is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out "3.04", "2.28", and "1.52" and inserting in lieu thereof "3.35", "2.51", and "1.67", respectively; and (2) by striking out "\$200" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$250."

(b) Section 3 (c) of such act is amended by inserting after "or in excess of \$350 for any month after June 30, 1954," the following: "and before July 1, 1957, or in excess of \$400 for any month after June 30, 1957."

(c) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "\$4.55" and "\$75.90" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5.00" and "\$83.50", respectively; (2) by striking out "is less than the amount, or the additional amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "is less than 110 percent of the amount, or 110 percent of the additional amount"; (3) by inserting after "age 65," the following: "women entitled to spouse's annuities pursuant to elections made under subsection (h) of section 2 to be entitled to wife's insurance benefits determined under section 202 (q) of the Social Security Act,"; and (4) by striking out "such amount of such additional amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "110 percent of such amount or 110 percent of such additional amount."

SEC. 3. (a) Sections 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out of the first sentence the following: "who will have died leaving no widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to receive an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred"; (2) by inserting in the first sentence after "10 times the employee's basic amount" the following: ", but not to exceed a total of \$750,"; and (3) by striking out the fourth sentence.

(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of such act is amended by striking out "and 7 percent of his or her compensation after December 31, 1946 (exclusive in both cases of compensation in excess of \$300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in the latter case in excess of \$350 for any month after June 30, 1954)," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "plus 7 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1946, and before January 1, 1957, plus 7½ percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1956, and before January 1, 1958, plus 8 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1957 (exclusive of compensation in excess of \$300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in excess of \$350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before July 1, 1957, and in excess of \$400 for any month after June 30, 1957),";

(c) Section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "\$33", "\$176", and "\$15.40" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "\$36.30", "\$193.60", and "\$16.95", respectively.

(d) Section 5 (i) (1) (ii) of such act is amended by striking out "or in which month he engaged on seven or more different calendar days in noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States (as defined in sec. 203 (k) of the Social Security Act)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, having engaged in any activity outside the United States, would be charged under such section 203 (e) with any earnings derived from such activity if it had been an activity within the United States."

(e) Clause (A) (1) of section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended by striking out the word "and" appearing after "July 1, 1954," and by inserting after "June 30, 1954," the following: "and before July 1, 1957, and any excess over \$400 for any calendar month after June 30, 1957."

(f) Clause (A) (ii) of section 5 (l) (19) of such act is amended (1) by inserting "and before 1957" after "1954" where it first appears; (2) by inserting after "\$4,200" where it first appears the following: "or, for the calendar year 1957 is less than \$4,500, or for any calendar year after 1957 is less than \$4,800,"; (3) by striking out "\$350" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$400"; and (4) by striking out "and \$4,200 for the years after 1954, by" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", \$4,200 for years after 1954 and before 1957, \$4,500 for the year 1957, and \$4,800 for years after 1957, by."

(g) Section 5 (l) (10) of such act is amended by striking out "44", "11", "\$350", "\$15.40", "\$33.66", "\$27.50", and "\$14.66" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "49", "12", "\$400", "\$16.95", "\$40.33", "\$30.25", and "\$16.13", respectively.

SEC. 4. All pensions under section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, all joint and survivor annuities and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities under that act awarded before July 1, 1957, and all annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, are increased by 10 percent.

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by section 1 (other than subsec. (b) thereof), by subsections (a) and (c) of section 2, and by subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities (not including annuities to which sec. 4 applies) accruing for months after June 1957. The amendment made by subsection (b) of section 1 shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing during the calendar year 1957 and subsequent calendar years. The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to lump-sum payments (under secs. 5 (f) (1) and 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after June 1957. The amendments made by subsection (g) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after June 1957 and lump-sum payments (under sec. 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after June 1957. Section 4 shall be effective only with respect to pensions due in calendar months after July 1957 and annuities accruing for months after June 1957.

(b) All recertifications required by reason of the amendments made by this part shall be made by the Railroad Retirement Board without application therefor.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Sections 3201, 3202 (a), 3211, and 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each amended (1) by striking out "after December 31, 1954" wherever it appears and

inserting in lieu thereof "after June 30, 1957", and (2) by striking out "\$350" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$400."

(b) Sections 3202 (a) and 3221 of such act are each further amended by striking out "after 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "after June 1957."

(c) Sections 3201 and 3221 of such act are each further amended by striking out "6½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "7½ percent."

(d) Section 3201 of such act is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: "Provided, That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1969, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

(e) Section 3211 of such act is further amended by striking out "12½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent", and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: "Provided, That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1969, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to twice the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

(f) Section 3221 of such act is further amended by inserting "(a)" before "In addition", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The rate of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1969, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3111 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3111 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by section 201 shall, except as otherwise provided in such amendments, be effective only with respect to compensation paid after June 30, 1957, for services rendered after such date.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

SEC. 301. Section 1 (i) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the proviso in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Provided, however, That in computing the compensation paid to any employee, no part of any month's compensation in excess of \$300 for any month before July 1, 1954, or in excess of \$350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before July 1, 1957, or in excess of \$400 for any month after June 30, 1957, shall be recognized."

SEC. 302. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the language between "(i)" and "(ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for each day of unemployment in excess of four during any registration period, and".

(b) Section 2 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out columns I and II and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Column I Total compensation	Column II Daily benefit rate
\$500 to \$699.99	\$4.50
700 to 999.99	5.00
1,000 to 1,299.99	5.50
1,300 to 1,599.99	6.00
1,600 to 1,899.99	6.50
1,900 to 2,199.99	7.00
2,200 to 2,499.99	7.50
2,500 to 2,799.99	8.00
2,800 to 3,099.99	8.50
3,100 to 3,499.99	9.00
3,500 to 3,999.99	9.50
4,000 and over	10.20."

(c) The proviso in such section 2 (a) is amended by striking out "50" and "\$8.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "60" and "\$10.20", respectively.

SEC. 303. Section 2 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: "And provided, further, That, with respect to an employee who has 5 or more years of service as defined in section 1 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, and who had current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment in a benefit year but has exhausted such rights, the benefit year in which such rights are exhausted shall be deemed not to be ended until the last day of the extended benefit period determined under the following schedule, and the maximum number of days of, and amount of payment for, unemployment within such benefit year for which benefits may be paid to the employee shall be enlarged to include all compensable days of unemployment within such extended benefit period:

The extended benefit period shall begin on the first day of unemployment following the day on which the employee exhausted his then current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment and shall continue for successive 14-day periods (each of which periods shall constitute a registration period) until the number of such 14-day periods totals—	
"If the employee's 'years of service' total—	
5 and less than 10.....	39
10 and less than 15.....	65
15 and less than 20.....	91
20 and over.....	117

but no such extended benefit period shall extend beyond the beginning of the first registration period in a benefit year in which the employee is again qualified for benefits in accordance with section 3 of this act on the basis of compensation earned after the first of such successive 14-day periods has begun. For an employee who has 5 or more years of service, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, who has 14 or more consecutive days of unemployment, and who is not a 'qualified employee' for the general benefit year current when such unemployment commences but is or becomes a 'qualified employee' for the next succeeding general benefit year, such succeeding benefit year shall, in his case, begin on the first day of the month in which such unemployment commences."

SEC. 304. Section 3 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "\$400" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500."

SEC. 305. Section 4 (a-2) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out subdivision (iv), and by striking out the semicolon at the end of subdivision (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 306. Section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it first appears the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, and is not in excess of \$400 for any calendar month paid by him to any employee for services rendered to him after June 30, 1957"; (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the second time the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, and to not more than \$400 for any month after June 30, 1957"; (3) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the third time the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, or less than \$400 if such month is after June 30, 1957"; (4) by striking out "1947" in paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "1957"; and (5) by striking out the table (except the column headings) in such paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"\$450,000,000 or more.....	2 percent
\$400,000,000 or more but less than \$450,000,000.....	2½ percent
\$350,000,000 or more but less than \$400,000,000.....	3 percent
\$300,000,000 or more but less than \$350,000,000.....	3½ percent
Less than \$300,000,000.....	4 percent."

SEC. 307. Section 8 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by striking out "3 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 per centum"; and (2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", and before July 1, 1957, and as is not in excess of \$400 paid to him for services rendered as an employee representative in any calendar month after June 30, 1957."

SEC. 308. The amendments made by sections 302, 303, and 305 shall be effective with respect to benefits accruing in general benefit years which begin after the benefit year ending June 30, 1957, and in extended benefit periods which begin after December 31, 1956. The amendment made by section 304 shall be effective with respect to base years after the base year ending December 31, 1956. The amendment made by clause (1) of section 307 shall apply with respect to compensation paid for services rendered in calendar months after June 30, 1957.

The analysis presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

ANALYSIS

PART 1. THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

1. All annuities (age and disability retirement, spouses', and survivors') pensions, and insurance lump sums, under the Railroad Retirement Act would be increased by 10 percent (except annuities which are, or would be, based on the equivalent of the annuitant's average monthly compensation while working in the railroad industry);

2. An employee who was retired on an annuity by reason of disability would not lose the annuity for any month in which he earned more than \$100 in outside employment if his total earnings in the year, which includes such month, do not exceed \$1,200; and if such earnings exceed \$1,200, the annuitant would not lose more than 1 month's annuity for each \$100 of such excess, treating the last \$50 or more of such excess as \$100;

3. Women railroad employees with less than 30 years of service, would be eligible for annuities at age 62 rather than age 65, but the annuity would be on a reduced basis (women with 30 years of service are now, and will continue to be, eligible for full retirement at age 60);

4. A spouse's annuity would be payable at age 62, rather than age 65, upon election

of the spouse to receive such annuity on a reduced basis;

5. The "insurance" lump sum (which is not now payable if the deceased employee is survived by a person entitled to an annuity in the month in which the employee died) would be payable even if the deceased is survived by a person so entitled, but the amount would in no case exceed \$750;

6. The maximum creditable compensation under the act would be increased from \$350 to \$400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957;

7. The residual lump sum would be increased to reflect the increase in the maximum creditable monthly compensation; and

8. For survivor beneficiaries who work outside the United States the work limitations on benefits would be the same as are now provided for work in the United States.

PART II. THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

In order to provide funds for the proposed increases in benefits, and to take care of any present deficiency in the railroad retirement account, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act would be amended as follows:

1. The tax base would be increased from the present maximum of \$350 a month to \$400, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957;

2. The tax rates on employers and employees would be increased from the present 6½ percent of payroll on each side, up to \$350 a month, to 7½ percent of payroll on each side, up to \$400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957;

3. The tax rates on employee representatives would be increased from the present 12½ percent of payroll, up to \$350 a month, to 15 percent of payroll, up to \$400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after June 30, 1957; and

4. An additional increase in tax rates with respect to compensation paid for services beginning January 1, 1970, is provided, but such increase would be conditioned upon, and would be equal to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) of the increase in the rate of social security employment taxes which, as now scheduled, would not be effective before 1965. (The reason for this proposed conditional increase is that if social-security taxes increase as scheduled, the retirement account will be charged correspondingly more under the financial interchange arrangement, and to the extent of such increases scheduled for 1965 and thereafter it is necessary to increase retirement taxes to the same extent on compensation paid after 1969 in order to continue on an actuarially sound basis.)

PART III. THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

In order to improve the lot of unemployed railroad workers, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act would be amended as follows:

1. The daily benefit rate would be increased from 50 percent of compensation for the employee's last employment in a base year, to 60 percent of such compensation;

2. The maximum daily benefit rate would be increased from \$8.50 to \$10.20;

3. Sundays and holidays would be treated as days of unemployment for unemployment purposes;

4. The number of days for which benefits may be paid in the first registration period in a benefit year would be 10 (instead of 7), the same as in subsequent registration periods in the same benefit year;

5. For a career railroad employee (one with at least 5 years of railroad service) who is out of work through no fault of his own, the bill would extend the period during which he may receive benefits. These extended

periods would vary in length, depending, generally, on the length of the beneficiary's previous employment, so that an unemployed man with 20 or more years of service would receive benefits for as much as 4½ years longer than he might otherwise receive;

6. The minimum earnings in a base year which would qualify an employee for benefits in the benefit year would be increased from \$400 to \$500;

7. The maximum taxable earnings in a month would be increased from \$350 to \$400; and

8. The contribution rate would be increased to 2 percent of creditable compensation when the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account would total \$450 million or more; and this rate would be increased, by steps, to 4 percent of such compensation when the balance in the account fell below \$300 million.

The bill (H. R. 3665) by Mr. McCARTHY would exempt from Federal income tax and withholding all employees railroad retirement taxes.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, today I introduced a bill in behalf of myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

I wish the RECORD to show definitely that neither the first sponsor of the bill nor the cosponsors take the position that this bill is the bill which should be passed without any changes. All we say, Mr. President, is that a strong prima facie case has been made for the proposals contained in the bill. We think the bill should be submitted to very early hearings, and if the evidence shows that changes will make it a better bill, I can assure the Senate each one of us in our individual capacities reserves the right to consider such changes.

It is in that spirit and with that feeling that I introduce the bill, urging, as I do so, that the best bill which can be reported by the committee, after full hearings, ought to be considered and passed at this session of Congress, because the great body of railroad workers should receive the justice which is due them and which was not given them in the last session of the Congress as a result of unfortunate delays. As chairman of the subcommittee let me say that we are going to do everything within our power to get the earliest possible action on a fair railroad retirement bill in this session of the Congress.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am in full accord with the statements which have been made by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon. In 1954, when I was a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I had the opportunity to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which considered at that time amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, and in that session of the Congress the bill was passed.

I agree with my distinguished colleague from Oregon that steps must be taken to make that act more effective.

I should like to say for myself that I, too, reserve my decision. While agreeing with the objectives of the bill which has been introduced, I hold myself open to recommend and to support such changes as will make the bill more effective and more in accord with the general objective.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much.

CHRISTOFFER HANNEVIG—REFERENCE OF CLAIM TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which, if enacted, would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of one Christoffer Hannevig, of Norway, for compensation against the United States. The claim is allegedly derived from the requisition of certain properties by agencies of the United States Government during the First World War.

The United States has consistently denied the validity of the Hannevig claim, which is predicated upon his alleged interest in certain corporations affected by the requisition orders. Nevertheless, in a convention between Norway and the United States which entered into force on November 9, 1948—TIAS, 1865; 62d Statutes at Large, page 1798—it was agreed that the Hannevig claim would be referred to the Court of Claims, with possible appeal to the United States Supreme Court, in the event that the two Governments were unable to reach a settlement by diplomatic procedures. Such procedures have reached an impasse.

Article II of the convention specifically recognized that the provisions for referring the claim to the American courts "are subject to authorization by the Congress of the United States." The bill which I am now introducing would provide the requisite legislative authorization to enable the United States to comply with an international obligation which it assumed in the convention. By this bill, our Government is merely giving effect to procedures originally contemplated when the Senate gave its approval to the convention.

I should add, Mr. President, that the claim here involved seeks the recovery of a principal sum of \$25 million, together with interest computed from 1917 at the rate of 6 percent. Although it believes the legal basis of the claim to be highly dubious, the Department of State is most desirous that the issue be adjudicated and disposed of by our courts, not only to remove a long-standing source of irritation between Norway and the United States, but also to give effect to an international obligation we assumed in 1948.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks a letter

dealing with this matter sent to the Vice President by the Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) to implement the Convention between the United States of America and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, for the disposition of the claim against the Government of the United States of America asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The letter presented by Mr. GREEN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 26, 1956.
The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose a draft of proposed legislation to implement the Convention between the United States and Norway, which entered into force on November 9, 1948, relating to the disposition of an international claim against the United States asserted by the Government of Norway on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig.

The claim is advanced on account of losses and damages alleged to have been sustained by Christoffer Hannevig as a result of acts of this Government, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, their officers and agents, in connection with requisition orders affecting certain properties in the United States during World War I.

It was stipulated in the above-mentioned Convention (TIAS 1865; 62 Stat. 1798) that the facts and law relating to the claim be developed by pleadings and briefs to be exchanged by the respective agents of the two Governments. It was also stipulated that if the two Governments were, after such exchange, unable to agree upon a disposition of the claim through diplomatic discussions, the pleadings, and briefs so exchanged be submitted for decision by the United States Court of Claims, with possible appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Article II of the Convention contained an understanding that the provisions for possible reference of the claim to the courts "are subject to authorization by the Congress of the United States of America."

In view of the fact that, after considering the pleadings and briefs which were exchanged, the two Governments were not able to agree upon a disposition of the claim through diplomatic discussions, it is respectfully requested that the Congress enact legislation vesting the courts with jurisdiction to decide the case, as contemplated by the Convention.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

MARIA CACCOMO—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 308) for the relief of Maria Caccomo, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

CIII—145

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

On page 4, line 13, strike out "Charter of the United Nations" and insert in lieu thereof "Constitution of the United States."

On page 5, line 9, after the word "used" insert "for either economic or military assistance."

INCREASED COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS—ADDITIONAL CO-SPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] may be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 39) to increase the monthly wartime rates of compensation payable to service-connected disabled veterans, and to the bill (S. 40) to liberalize the basis for payment, and to increase the monthly rates, of death pension payable to widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean conflict, introduced by me, on behalf of myself and other Senators, on January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

Address delivered by Senator PASTORE at the American Chemical Society symposium, held at Johnson's Hummocks, Providence, R. I., February 8, 1957.

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement prepared by him on Ukrainian Independence Day.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Report No. 13 by him to the people of Wisconsin.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article by Senator HENNINGS entitled "Washington Seminar on Government," published in the NEA Journal for February 1957.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of January 26, 1957, and letter written by him relating to Government aid to colleges.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLEMENT F. HAYNSWORTH, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, FOURTH CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 7, 1957, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge, fourth circuit, vice Armistead M. Dobie, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

CENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, February 23, 1957, marks the 100th anniversary of one of our country's most distinguished professional societies—the American Institute of Architects.

As the national organization representing the American architect, the American Institute of Architects is making a vital contribution to the material and cultural welfare of our people. Its first century of service is filled with great achievements in solving the complex problems of planning human environment.

One of these important achievements is the continuing effort of the AIA to maintain and raise the professional standards and the strict code of ethics which govern the practice of the architectural profession and the relationship of the architect with his client. Before the AIA was founded on February 23, 1857, untrained and unqualified persons, many of them engaged in cut-throat competition among each other, frequently undertook to practice architecture with the result that our buildings were often unsafe and esthetically unworthy. Today, thanks to the idealism of the 13 young architects who founded the AIA 100 years ago, our people and their Government can confidently expect the professional and duly registered architect to provide competent and devoted service with the highest technical and esthetic standards of any nation in the world.

Early in its history, the AIA recognized that the betterment of the architectural profession required it to give guidance and support to the training of young people in the art and skills of architecture. The AIA was instrumental in the establishment of the Nation's first architectural schools at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia University, and the University of Illinois. It is giving active support to the more than 100 architectural schools which have been founded since that time.

While the AIA and its 12,000 members, organized in 124 local chapters, are constantly striving for progress in the technology and art of building, the institute is also deeply devoted to preserving and cherishing the best in our architectural tradition. It has demonstrated this in its energetic efforts to restore the original concepts which Thomas Jefferson and his great contemporary, the French architect L'Enfant, held of the Nation's Capital. The AIA has set an example of maintaining our great architectural monuments by restoring Washington's charming Octagon House, once the home of President Madison, and making it its national headquarters.

Elsewhere, too, local chapters of the AIA are guiding the planning and rebuilding of our communities to safeguard the architectural heritage of the past, erase the blight and ease the congestion of the present, and accommodate the new requirements of the future.

History has recorded that the most enduring monuments of any civilization are its buildings in which its people dwell, conduct their business, entertain themselves, house their treasures, practice the arts and sciences, and worship God. All these activities are as much influenced by the buildings in which they take place, as these structures are influenced by the manner in which we live, earn our bread, pursue our search for knowledge, and worship. Thus, the architect who plans and designs our environment bears a heavy responsibility as the catalyst of our culture.

The American architect, and the American Institute of Architects as the national organization which works for his betterment and represents him, are assuming this responsibility to our people and our Nation in a manner which merits our tribute. Speaking as a citizen, I can say that we are deeply grateful for the fine work the men and women of the American Institute of Architects are doing. We extend our heartfelt congratulations to this society on the occasion of its centennial year, and wish it well in the national centennial celebration, to be held here in Washington this coming May.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute, which is the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are many Members of the Senate who desire to speak on the pend-

ing resolution. I have been informed by some of those Senators that they are not ready to speak at this stage of the debate. I think the average Senator prefers to speak when the Chamber is full and after a unanimous-consent agreement has been reached, and when he is sure that most of the Senators will hear what he has to say. But, Mr. President, we are not in a position to obtain an agreement to limit discussion at this time, and I want to appeal to Senators who desire to speak on the pending resolution to prepare themselves, and to appear, and to speak.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 91, Senate Resolution 99, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. Before the clerk reads the title for the information of the Senate, I will say that it is a resolution which merely extends the date for the filing of a committee report. It has been cleared with both myself and with the minority leader. Probably it will require no discussion or debate. However, it is necessary to extend the date for the filing of the report. I hope the Senate may act on it at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection. The distinguished majority leader, with his customary courtesy, has consulted me in connection with this resolution, as he always consults me on these matters. It is a resolution which should be considered and disposed of promptly.

I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

DEBATE ON THE MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to say something which I believe is equally applicable to Senators on both sides of the aisle, and I have requested the secretaries to contact Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle in connection with it.

I hope very much that Senators who desire to speak on the pending joint resolution dealing with the Middle East may do so. We are now in our second day of debate of the joint resolution. I know there is a great deal to be said on it. Therefore, I hope that the speeches may be made while we have the time, rather than next week, when perhaps we may have in effect a unanimous consent agreement to limit debate. In that case

a limitation on time would be in effect and there would not be as much time available for debate as there is now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say this in no criticism of anyone. However, we are now debating the Middle East resolution, and it is my hope that every Senator will take advantage of the time now available to make his position known. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I share the views stated by the distinguished minority leader and I have expressed as forcefully as I can the sentiments just stated by him. I have asked the clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the clerk of the Committee on Armed Services to notify all members of the committee who may desire to discuss the joint resolution that there is time available for such discussion, certainly today, and I believe also tomorrow.

The majority leader is prepared to vote on the joint resolution now. We have had extended hearings on it. I have very definite views in connection with the matter, and those views have already been expressed by me to the Senate. I do not wish to act in haste, and I do not wish to preclude any Senator from stating his views at such length as he may desire.

However, Mr. President, we will not dillydally on a matter of such great importance. If there are no speakers present in the Chamber and if there should be a quorum call, and no Senators desire to speak, there will be just one thing to do, and that is to call the roll and have a vote on the resolution. Therefore, I join the distinguished minority leader in expressing the hope that the staffs of the respective committees will notify Senators that time is available to make their presentations.

NEW YORK TIMES COMMENT ON SENATOR ELLENDER'S REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the New York Times is almost universally regarded as one of our country's truly great newspapers. Its standards of fairness, accuracy, and objectivity have consistently been high—so much so that many of America's smaller newspapers have used the New York Times almost as a journalistic bible.

I was therefore extremely disappointed to find in the New York Times editorial of February 11, 1957, entitled, "Mr. ELLENDER'S Report" a number of inaccuracies. I feel sure that these were unintentional, but I should like at this time to set the record straight.

First, in referring to me personally, the editorial states:

He is especially concerned with our whole foreign-aid program. It will be remembered that he was sternly opposed to it before he left on this fact-finding tour.

Mr. President, I have never been opposed to our "whole foreign-aid program." As a matter of fact, I supported the Marshall plan for Western Europe at its inception and I voted for it for at least 3 years. I have no apologies to make for that support, or for my votes

for the program. However, after the original goals proposed to be achieved by the program had been exceeded, I felt it my duty to raise my voice in protest.

I have taken pains to emphasize on a number of occasions that I have never opposed our whole foreign-aid program in its entirety.

For example, in reporting on my 1955 inspection trip, I told the Senate on June 23, 1956, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 8, pages 11208-11219, that too much of our assistance consists of techniques, supplies, and capital projects far beyond the capabilities of peoples of underdeveloped lands to absorb. At that time, as on a number of other occasions, I concisely stated my prime criticism of our aid program—not that it exists, at all, but rather that it is loaded with waste. I stated:

It strikes me that we could spend one-fourth of the money we are now spending in those areas and get more for it if only we undertook reasonable, realistic projects instead of the grandiose schemes hatched by the fertile minds of our eager Washington planners. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 8, p. 11213.)

I reaffirmed this observation this year, when I said:

It strikes me that a program to be of most benefit to those people should be started at the bottom rung of the ladder. We should educate the people there in keeping with their ability to carry on. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 1957, p. 1689.)

This precise statement was made with respect to our aid program in Indonesia; however, as my subsequent remarks amply demonstrated, it was applicable to all other underdeveloped lands now receiving United States aid. I said:

Moreover, as I stated before, no projects should be promoted in that area of the world unless the host country—in this case Indonesia—is in a position to carry them financially. Unless that course is followed we will be trying to educate men and women to operate many of the projects to which I have referred for a long time. Unless the host government itself has the money to keep the operations under way, the United States will have to carry the burden for a long time, for if we failed to do so, we would probably end up making more enemies than friends. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 1957, p. 1689.)

As for being opposed to our whole foreign-aid program, reference to my report on the Philippines, which I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1957, pages 1693-1694, will show that I stated, in part, referring to technical assistance programs there:

It is heartwarming to see men and women of this generation striving to better themselves by producing better livestock, using local products so as to provide a balanced diet for their families, and learning rudimentary techniques in food preservation.

These programs of self-help will certainly pay dividends—this will occur because we are attempting to assist the people of this generation. Certainly, programs of this nature are to be preferred to the outright grant-aid which, if given lavishly, will result in the loss of self-respect by the donees * * *.

Mr. President, I believe these quotations, which were available to the New York Times reporters as well as its editorial writers, amply demonstrate that I was not sternly opposed to our whole

foreign-aid program before I left on my inspection trip.

Second, the editorial declares:

Everywhere that it has been tried, he (referring to me) now states, our large-scale economic aid has been an abysmal failure.

This reference to an abysmal failure was lifted completely out of context. The full portion of my prepared remarks was released to the press in advance of my address and the portion containing the phrase "Abysmal failure" reads as follows:

In spite of our huge expenditures in Western Europe, the United States seems compelled to maintain large information programs in these countries in order to demonstrate to the European governments that the United States is really not so bad, after all.

The record demonstrates an abysmal failure of the past program of large-scale economic aid, coupled with substantial sums in military assistance, as an effective means of winning the cold war.

Read in context, it is obvious that my reference to economic aid, and so forth, as an abysmal failure as a means of winning the cold war was in reference to Western Europe.

As for other areas of the world, I have frequently criticized the use to which this form of aid has been put, such as a light-bulb plant, a window-glass factory, and a number of other similar facilities in Formosa, flour mills in Korea, and the converting of an old opium plant in Saigon into a huge, air-conditioned motion picture studio for the use of the Government of Vietnam, because I felt the type of assistance rendered was nothing less than a complete waste of taxpayers' funds. As for being failures, these facilities are obviously just that if they are regarded as contributing anything substantial to bettering the way of life of the average man on the street whose homeland we are attempting to assist. However, I have never stated that everywhere that it has been tried economic aid has been an abysmal failure, and whoever wrote the editorial could have easily ascertained that by a bare minimum of research.

Third, the editorial raises a number of rhetorical questions, one of them being: In Western Europe, was the Marshall plan an abysmal failure?

Mr. President, if viewed in the light of its objectives, the Marshall plan has been an abysmal failure, even though it has restored the Western European countries to full economic health. The purpose of the Marshall plan was, as the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations stated in 1948 "to help European nations to help themselves to recovery in such a way as to become independent of outside assistance"—Senate Report No. 935, 80th Congress, 2d session, page 1.

Although the Marshall plan is generally regarded as having ended, reference to recent statistics will demonstrate that economic aid is still flowing to countries of Western Europe at this time—that Europe still is not independent of outside assistance.

In addition, in 1950, Paul Hoffman, at that time administrator of the

European Cooperation Administration, stated, with reference to the European aid program:

The surest way I know of to reduce the danger of war so that we may reduce our Military Establishment is to carry on the recovery program to a point where a free and self-sustaining and unified Europe is able to play its full role in cooperation with the United States and other free countries in maintaining the peace and prosperity of the world.

This statement was made in 1950 by Mr. Hoffman. On that occasion he stated that if we spent, not over \$30 billion, which we have spent, but only \$14 billion to \$17 billion, we would be able to attain the objective to which he referred.

This objective, too, has never been fulfilled, for while European industrial production today stands at 165 percent of prewar—compared with 125 percent of prewar which Mr. Hoffman had cited as the goal of the program—Europe is not helping the United States and other free countries in maintaining the peace. On the contrary, many countries in Western Europe are still standing with their hands out for more aid. I shall not discuss the part taken by France and England in the Suez Canal debacle, but we have obligated ourselves considerably to clear that mess.

There is no doubt that insofar as the economic goals of the Marshall plan are concerned, the program has been a success, for those goals were long ago achieved. However, so far as the political and related goals of the program are concerned—not the least of which was to place Western Europe in a position where she could be of aid to us, so we could taper off our foreign spending—the program has indeed been an abysmal failure, for the foreign spending still goes on and Europe is not helping us in other areas of the world to any appreciable extent. That fact, Mr. President, I have documented on this floor many times, and I shall not take up the time of the Senate to go into any more detail with reference to it.

It is this factor, and this factor primarily, about which I complain, and about which I believe the American people have a genuine right to complain, Mr. President.

Fourth, the editorial to which I have referred says this:

It will be recalled that even before he visited Korea Mr. ELLENDER had made his unfortunate reference to "bloodsucking" for which he subsequently made a halfhearted apology. In the light of such an episode his subsequent judgments, if they can be called that, are suspect, to say the least.

I told the Senate on February 7, 1957, that I never made such a statement (which is accurate); however, I might add at this point that if the Times desires to refer to an instance of where I did make such a statement, it might refer to CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume, 102, part 8, page 11210, where I stated, referring to our so-called NATO allies:

We still continue to be bloodsucked for more and more by our friends, who argue that we must continue to make these funds available to them, or the mutual defense program will collapse.

This statement was confined to our so-called allies in Western Europe; on the other hand, Mr. President, although I was referring to our Western allies, the term could as well apply to our own representatives who make up the budgets for the countries we are assisting.

In this connection, as I stated the other day, the budgets for Formosa and Korea—in fact, the budgets for all the countries of Asia—are not made by the government officials of those countries, but by our own representatives, good Americans, who, apparently do not consider that impact which all this spending will have on our own economy.

I never advocated, as the editorial states, that "we should quit spending ineffective money on the foes of Communists and instead 'begin dealing with the people of Russia'." I did advocate, and I shall advocate again and again and again, that the record has demonstrated that the outpouring of a solid and continuous stream of American wealth has, alone, worked no magic permanent change in the climate of the cold war. I believe, and I hope the New York Times will agree, that by capitalizing upon the increased educational level of the Russian people, by exposing them to our way of life, they can be made aware of the benefits a free life under a free government can offer. I believe that by so doing, a desire for a better life can be created among the Russian people, a desire which, if nourished carefully, can result in such pressure on the Russian leadership that it will renounce force as a weapon of foreign policy. I am anxious to let properly screened visitors from Russia see our homes, our farms, and our way of life. I think America and her freedoms have nothing to fear from a system which must hide its failure behind an Iron Curtain. I think that just as international communism seeks to capitalize upon the suppressed desires of underprivileged people for a better life, so can we capitalize upon the similar desires of the underprivileged people of Russia, with one glaring exception: Our campaign will be based upon truth, not fiction; upon demonstrable achievements, not merely vague Marxist promises. As I stated in my prepared remarks which were distributed to the press:

In other words, instead of relying solely upon a policy of deterrence by military force, an effort should be made to create a force within Russia, arising from the Russian people, to compel a change in Russian policies. In the interim, Western strength must be maintained; however, a successful conclusion of the program which I would like to see tried, would eventually result in a peaceful settlement between the Soviet Union and the United States and a consequent reduction in armaments.

I regret that I must take the time of the Senate to make this address, Mr. President; however, in order to keep the record straight, and in the interest of accuracy, I felt it was necessary for me to do so.

EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objec-

tion to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 99?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 99) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 162, agreed to February 8, 1956, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs, as amended by Senate Resolution 60, agreed to January 30, 1957, is further amended by striking out "February 28, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what was the resolution which was just agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The resolution extended the filing date of a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations. Its consideration was agreed to by the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader, but before the question was put as to its consideration, the minority leader made a statement about the necessity of having Senators come to the floor to speak on the joint resolution concerning the Middle East. The majority leader concurred in that statement. Apparently the Presiding Officer, not wishing to interrupt either the minority leader or the majority leader while we were talking, did not put the question concerning the request of the majority leader that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 99.

In the meantime, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] obtained the floor, and I assume this is the first opportunity which the Presiding Officer has had to put the question.

But I assure my distinguished friend, the acting minority leader, that he is fully protected. The majority leader would never permit advantage to be taken, if advantage could be taken, which the majority leader knows it could not be, so long as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota occupied the chair of the minority leader.

The resolution merely extends the date for the filing of a report by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The request for its consideration is fully concurred in by the very able and genial minority leader, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and by the majority leader.

Mr. THYE. The explanation made by the distinguished majority leader is sufficient for the acting minority leader. But the request had been made before I assumed this position, and for that reason I desired an explanation, because I had assured the minority leader that I would make certain that no proposed legislation would be passed without his being informed of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished minority leader is fully informed, and the acting minority leader has the assurance of the Senator from Texas that no measure will ever be presented without the knowledge of the minority leader, if he does not always have his consent.

Mr. THYE. I am confident of that, but I wanted to know what was embodied in the resolution which was just agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the resolution has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while I have the acting minority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], in such a wonderful frame of mind—it is not always that one can get the Republicans to go along with us—I have a very unusual request to make. I feel certain I can get the Senate to agree to this, and I invite the attention of the acting minority leader to my request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet for a short while this afternoon while the Senate is in session. I am informed that the only witness who is scheduled to be heard is the minority whip, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Unless consent shall be given, the subcommittee cannot sit without violating the rules of the Senate, and the distinguished minority whip will be deprived of the opportunity to give his testimony on proposed legislation which is now being considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. THYE. There is no objection. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that the Republicans will always endeavor to be cooperative, as we always have been in the past, and I hope will be in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I expect to speak rather briefly on the joint resolution which is now before the Senate.

I have not had the opportunity to hear the testimony that members of the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees, have heard, but I have read some of the hearings and followed the releases from the committee very diligently.

President Eisenhower made it emphatically clear in his original announcement and served notice that the United States regards the preservation of the "independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East not only as vital to the national interest, but also to world peace."

As I read President Eisenhower's statement, I tried to draw an analogy between our position as a nation in 1956 and the statement of policy that was issued in President Monroe's message to Congress on December 2, 1823, to the effect that the United States could not regard with indifference any further territorial expansion on the part of European powers on the American Continent.

I think it could be well said that statement on the part of President Monroe was made in regard to the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The exact words in President Monroe's message were:

The American continents by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

While this message called attention to what President Monroe considered to be the difference between the political systems of the monarchies of Europe and of America, it definitely stated that any attempt on the part of these European monarchies to extend their system to any portion of the Western Hemisphere would be regarded as dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States.

Very spirited debate preceded the approval and adoption of the Monroe Doctrine by the Congress and its acceptance by the Nation.

The question at that time, as it is now, was how far our Nation should go in assuming obligations which we believe are in the interests of peace and security on every area of the globe.

It can be accurately stated that as a Nation—because of modern methods of communication and transportation—we are closer today to all areas of the globe than we were to countries in the Western Hemisphere in 1823. Today we are closer to the Suez Canal and to Cambodia in the Far East than we were to the Isthmus of Panama and Rio de Janeiro in 1823.

The Monroe Doctrine at the time of its adoption accomplished the very purpose for which it was established; namely, to warn a group of European powers, known as the Holy Alliance, not to interfere with the independence of the newly formed Spanish-American nations.

The actions taken under the Monroe Doctrine were unilateral actions. Under the joint resolution before the Congress at the present time, there is a declaration that when the President determines it is in the national interest of world peace for the United States to use its Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism, such assistance shall be available, provided that its employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

The Monroe Doctrine is simply an American policy, and since its adoption it has been used by practically every President of the United States. Under

some Presidents, this policy has approximated a claim of a protectorate over the Latin American countries, and, therefore, was deeply resented by them. However, it has never been our policy to regard the Monroe Doctrine as having such a meaning.

Under the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, we did adopt a policy whereby all the American States were pledged to oppose aggression from outside this hemisphere, and to minimize conflict among themselves by consultation when threats of peace arose.

As I stated earlier, there seem to me to be many analogies between our position today in the affairs of the world and the position we occupied in 1823.

Our Nation has never fought a war for territorial gain; but on several occasions we have entered into war for humanitarian reasons, when we believed that to do so was in the interest of the preservation of the freedoms and liberties that our people enjoy in a democracy.

Today, we are confronted in the world with a very serious conflict of ideologies. The conflict is between democracy and totalitarianism, and between communism and capitalism. In fact, it becomes a conflict between governments which believe that a person is a chattel of the state and governments which believe that a person is a sovereign of the state.

As I understand from reading the pending joint resolution, it is a reaffirmation of the United States foreign-aid policy; and by means of the resolution we would extend assistance to other nations, in order that they may become free and strong. This position was advanced in prior acts on the part of Congress, especially in the Security Act of 1954.

By the passage of this joint resolution by the Congress of the United States, we shall demonstrate to the world the united action taken by the executive and legislative branches of our Government in recognizing that the national integrity of other free nations is directly related to our own security. We have taken this position in several previous resolutions and bilateral defense agreements.

As I read the joint resolution, I firmly believe that it seeks the following objectives:

First. To protect the territorial integrity and independence of the Middle East nations by deterring possible attacks upon them by countries controlled by international communism. It thus attempts to effect for the area a degree of stability essential to the solution of its problems by peaceful means;

Second. To bolster the Middle East nations psychologically at this critical period, in order that they may resist communism more effectively;

Third. To assist them, in this emergency and later, in opposing Communist subversion, by strengthening them economically and providing them with the means of achieving internal stability.

Fourth. To reaffirm United States policy that we do not intend to intervene in the affairs of any foreign nation or violate its sovereignty; that we will assist any such nation only by agreement and consent.

Fifth. To reaffirm our interest in the development of the Middle East nations toward freedom, independence, and self-determination as member nations of the world, by promoting their economic growth and stability and thus lessening their weakness to external economic pressures; and

Sixth. To prevent a third world war and to promote in the area the needed peace which will permit the great petroleum and other economic potentials of the area to be used for the benefit of itself and of other nations of the world.

Mr. President, I, together with every other Member of this Congress, am concerned about preserving the inherent rights of the Congress to declare war. As I read the pending resolution, I cannot find that there is in it a delegation of authority in this respect, or that it authorizes the President to declare war. I, for one, would be violently opposed to it if it did.

President Eisenhower has on several occasions expressed his view in regard to a declaration of war, and has said that he feels keenly that only the Congress has the power to declare war.

In his address of January 5, the President stated:

If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would of course, maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

I realize that this statement made by the President on January 5 is not included in the resolution; but so far as I am concerned, it has the same effect as if it were incorporated in the resolution.

I believe President Eisenhower's proposal, which is the basis of the resolution, is in the interest of the national security and the future peace of the United States; and I intend to support the resolution. It is my sincere hope that the joint resolution will speedily be passed by this Congress, for I think time is of the essence.

IF PARTNERSHIP IS BAD FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY OF CALIFORNIA, IT IS BAD FOR THE COLUMBIA VALLEY OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 19, the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] announced himself as firmly and unalterably opposed to administration plans for a so-called power partnership with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at the Central Valley project.

I commend Senator KUCHEL for thus opposing the scheme of the Eisenhower administration for surrendering to a private-utility company the hydroelectric-power resources of the Trinity River. I pledge myself to support him in his efforts to protect the natural resources of his State from this kind of selfish exploitation. I endorse his statement that "the Secretary's recommendation for

private-power development at Trinity is fraught with many perils."

Mr. President, if so-called partnership with the private utilities is bad at Trinity, a comparatively small project, it is even worse in the Columbia River Basin where, through the beneficence of a generous Creator, lurks over 40 percent of all the potential waterpower in the United States. Yet in the Columbia Basin, the administration still clings to the discredited partnership program which Senator KUCHEL, a distinguished Republican, has so rightly condemned as being against the public interest and welfare. Only last week, in a discussion with me at a hearing of the Senate Public Works Committee, the Assistant Director of the Budget, Mr. Robert E. Merriam, stated publicly that the administration had not abandoned its partnership plans for the great John Day site on the mighty Columbia.

I invite Senator KUCHEL and his distinguished Republican senior colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to join with us of the Pacific Northwest in resisting the so-called private-power partnership from fastening its selfish grip on the water-power wealth of the greatest of all American river basins for power generation. Both Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL voted in 1956 against the great Hells Canyon project on the Snake River, main tributary of the Columbia.

Now that partnership threatens the Trinity River Basin in their own State, we invite them to join us this time in pushing to passage our bill for the great Federal high dam at Hells Canyon, which is the key to integrated development of the Columbia River Valley, where the bulk of America's treasure trove of waterpower is now concentrated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Oregon yield to his colleague?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the invitation my colleague has just extended to the two Senators from California to join with us on the Hells Canyon Dam proposal, which will preserve for the American people their full heritage in their own natural resources, and which is aimed at bringing to a halt the Eisenhower administration's giveaway of the natural resources in the Hells Canyon Dam reach of the Snake River for the privateering by private utilities.

My colleague has mentioned the issue with respect to partnership in the case of the Trinity project. I am very glad he did.

On last Friday I spoke to the Commonwealth Club of California, in San Francisco; and I made clear to that club that I would do my utmost to prevent giving away again to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. the people's rights to the profits from multiple-purpose dams, such as the Trinity Dam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that speech printed in the RECORD following our remarks on the subject matter, if the Senator does not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my speech before the Commonwealth Club I made it very clear, in my judgment, that the people of California are not entitled to have the taxpayers of the United States pay the check for all the nonreimbursable costs of the Trinity project and then have the private utilities pick up the profits. That is not my idea of partnership. I taught a course in partnership for some time. Of course, the elementary principle of partnership is that, unless the partners themselves contract to the contrary, they jointly share any profits of the enterprise. But that is not the Eisenhower administration concept of partnership. Its concept is that the taxpayers shall pay the cost and the big business interests that support the administration take the profits. Well, Mr. President, that is not going to be done by my vote in the Senate, and it is not going to be done by my sleeping on my parliamentary rights.

I have this much further to say on the Trinity partnership. I found while in California that there is a terrific propaganda drive on in California not only to use the partnership formula for the Trinity project, but also to emasculate the Federal reclamation law in connection with the 160-acre limitation provision. If that is going to be the program of the administration, it will have a fight on its hands.

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, we need to have an investigation of the newly announced, but still rather vague, policies of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, not only in regard to the Trinity project but in regard to the Pleasant Valley project and other projects on which he has been sending out trial balloons.

With respect to Trinity, the statement of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] does not surprise me much, because when he offered the Trinity bill, I engaged him in a colloquy. The junior Senator from California at that time, in answer to my questions, made it perfectly clear that the request for an authorization for Trinity was not based upon any partnership proposal. Therefore, I am very pleased to have the statement, or the public announcement, from the junior Senator from California, and I think he is entitled to great credit, particularly in view of what I know to be a terrific drive underway in California, with the assistance of the new Secretary of the Interior, who is beginning to give evidence that he is for a giveaway program as much as was his predecessor, despite the fact that the people of the Northwest on November 6 gave a very clear answer to such suggestions. I want to say to the Eisenhower administration they are going to get that same answer in 1958, and in 1960, too, if they continue to give to the private utilities the advantages of partnership under a giveaway program.

I commend the junior Senator from Oregon as Mr. Conservationist of the Senate for raising his voice again in

opposition to the administration's giveaway program in the field of public power development under the guise of a partnership arrangement, in which the partners do not share equally, but in which the taxpayers pay the costs and the private utilities pick up the profits.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my distinguished senior colleague for his very pertinent observations. I have already had the privilege of including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one of the effective speeches which he delivered last week in the State of California. I know he and I share the hope that the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], now that he has seen the evil impact of the partnership program on his own State, will join us in the Pacific Northwest in an effort to keep partnership from being fastened for at least half a century on our resources.

EXHIBIT 1

WATER AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Address by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, before Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., February 15, 1957)

I was very happy to accept the invitation of the Commonwealth Club despite the radical sound of its name. I have it on good authority that the proper pronunciation calls for accenting the last syllable.

If the eminent British consul is here, let me assure him publicly that as an American and a Democrat I come in peace—and sympathy for the problems our two democratic countries face together.

In all seriousness, the Commonwealth Club is to be congratulated for maintaining the democratic institution of an open forum for the discussion of great public issues and the presentation of differing points of view. Open forums and open minds are indispensable to a free society. A complex world requires the friction of vigorous, unfettered debate if solutions are to be found for great public problems.

So, I propose to discuss today a problem that is critical throughout America and is reaching really serious proportions in California today—water.

WATER: THE INDISPENSABLE ELEMENT

Over 2,500 years ago the Greeks believed that there were four elements—earth, air, fire, and water and that all other things were combinations of these. While their chemistry was faulty, the emphasis of the Greeks was eminently correct.

Without water human and plant life is impossible. Lack of adequate water has doomed whole areas that once flourished.

In the strife-torn Middle East, for example, there was four times the amount of land under cultivation in Roman times as there is today.

Nowhere is the dramatic role of water more evident, nor its need more crucial, than in the great valleys of California.

It is within man's power to waste water or use it to the full. The most fearful waste is that which permits the destruction of sources of water by failure to protect watersheds and the irresponsible pollution of our God-given streams.

Population growth and concentration, new industrial uses, and the proven benefits and necessity of irrigated farming have created vast new requirements for water. For example, at the Hanford Atomic Energy Commission Works, where a prodigious amount of the flow of Columbia River is diverted to provide the plant's cooling system. A soft-drink bottling plant uses thousands of gallons in very short periods. One shower bath can use up 6 to 14 gallons of hot water alone, depending on your habits.

In an average industrial community the per capita use of water runs between 100 to 200 gallons a day. A single fire hose has a minimum requirement of 250 gallons a minute.

There is little need to dwell on this point in water-conscious California. Other areas are acutely sensitive to the growing need for water. So, for example, suburban Westchester in New York now uses 77 million gallons of water a day, compared with 47 million gallons in 1943. The Great Plains drought is a national tragedy. In Texas alone 244 counties out of a total of 254 counties have been declared drought-disaster areas.

At the same time, floods are an imminent threat to cities, towns, and bottomlands throughout the Nation. New England, California, and Oregon suffered vast floods within the past 2 years. Kentucky and Tennessee are just coming out from under high water.

TVA'S SUCCESSFUL FLOOD FIGHT

TVA has once again proven its inestimable worth during the past few weeks. In this most recent flood, this great comprehensive, integrated basin system prevented flood damage, which, at a conservative official estimate, was about 65 million at Chattanooga alone. TVA already has resulted in prevention of property damage equal to more than half the amount allocated to flood control for the entire system. Last year the Columbia River dams, and particularly the great water-storage Grand Coulee Dam, helped avert great flood damage.

These recent experiences prove the wisdom of Theodore Roosevelt's and Gifford Pinchot's conservation program. They foresaw that natural-resource development requires a basin approach.

The main cause of water feast and famine is deforestation. Without adequate upland forest cover, water flow is irregular. By turns the runoff is too great or too little where great forests do not catch and hold water for gradual flow.

A balanced basin system also requires man-made storage to control water flow for flood control, manageable power output, irrigation, industrial and domestic use.

POWER: THE KEY TO WATER CONTROL

These great basin undertakings are not economically possible without power revenues. The electric power generated at multipurpose dams is vitally needed itself for farm, factory, and home. Unless its development is integrated with water storage for multiple use, all elements of development are retarded. As we progress with pollution control, it will probably be found that power has a major part to play in achieving it as well.

RECOGNITION OF PROBLEM THE FIRST STEP

It is urgent that the dimensions of our water problem be recognized for it takes years and decades to achieve the means of adequate multipurpose water development.

As population grows and technology becomes ever more complex we will find, I predict, that the adequacy of water systems will be the ultimate limitation upon our capacity to grow.

Once this factor is taken to heart, we can move forward to meet the challenge of the future.

FAIR SHARING REQUIRED

At the heart of Theodore Roosevelt's resource and reclamation philosophy was the sound and simple principle that it is the people of the Nation who own its natural resources. It followed that its development and benefits should be widely and equitably shared.

The great trust-buster also gave to this country a crystallization of the philosophy that monopoly is a prodigious threat to a free economy and free institutions.

So, when the great reclamation acts of his administration were enacted, the require-

ment was included that no beneficiary of a Federal reclamation project could obtain more than reasonable share of water from that project. An individual's right to own land was not infringed. But his right to obtain water from a public project, financed by public funds, was limited.

This 160-acre limitation is rooted in the history of the West. It is a requirement of elementary fairness.

Events in California in the past few weeks underscore the importance of this provision. I feel the California Supreme Court's *Ivanhoe* decision, which in effect sets aside the Federal reclamation law, was most unfortunate. I do not mean to comment on a matter of State concern. It is far more than that. A basic and vital Federal policy is involved. As a United States Senator I have an obligation to speak my deeply held views about this Federal policy.

The decision can result in some good. For it dramatizes a basic issue which must be resolved before adequate progress can be made in water-resource development.

Recognizing the vital role of river basin development on a comprehensive basis—for power, flood control, irrigation, navigation, and recreation—we must decide our future course.

On great interstate streams like the Columbia and Missouri it is clear that the Federal Government has a responsibility and alone can provide the unifying factor. This doesn't mean doing the whole job—but it does mean the main job of executing adequate plans and coordination. This means, as in TVA and the Columbia River System, the operating control of the key multipurpose dams in the systems. Such a plan is quite compatible with small private or local projects which do not affect the basic system.

Where a State cannot undertake a comprehensive plan for full development of a navigable stream of system within its borders, the Federal Government has a major role as well.

But, it is not fair or right to expect that the Federal Government should bear the burden of nonreimbursable costs for flood control, for example, and surrender, give away, the power facilities or the antimonopoly irrigation policy of Federal law.

The Trinity project is one example. I opposed partnership at Trinity and the project would not have been authorized in 1955 if partnership had been included. That is a simple statement of the facts.

Now California is considering the great multipurpose Feather River project as a State undertaking—but only partially so.

It is proposed that the State would finance part of the project without including the traditional and indispensable public-agency preference clause for power for the excess lands provisions for irrigation.

Yet it is seriously proposed that the Federal Government will authorize a blank check to pay for flood control with the Corps of Engineers to negotiate the amount. The blank check aspects are bad enough.

But, is it right or fair to ask that the Federal Treasury use taxpayer's money to help finance a multipurpose project and at the same time fail to include these two basic Federal policies? This is asking too much. Such over-reaching can defeat the whole proposal.

One Senator, at least, stands here who will oppose such a giveaway of funds and policy.

RESOLUTION OF POLICY DISPUTE PREREQUISITE TO PROGRESS

Before real progress can be made on comprehensive basin development for power, irrigation, flood control and the rest, there must be a resolution of the basic questions of policy on how we shall proceed. Extended controversy can only delay the undertaking of badly needed projects.

That has happened in my State and region. The voters of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and

Montana have rejected the administration's phoney partnership. Yet the administration seems determined to insist upon partnership, after even its congressional adherents have been defeated or rejected the method.

Congress will make good on some of the projects—as at John Day on the Columbia River. Yet, the close division of parties in Congress makes real progress impossible unless the dispute is settled and a real majority can pull together in one direction.

If the Republican administration will not see this fact, the voters will do it for them in 1958 and 1960—as they have done in the past two elections. I say this not in partisanship but in an appeal to Republicans who traditionally have supported the policies of Theodore Roosevelt, Hiram Johnson, Borah, McNary, and Norris—and Franklin D. Roosevelt as well—to get the administration back on the track.

It is necessary to achieve speedy relief from the uncertainty brought on by the *Ivanhoe* decisions. I pledge my best efforts to that end. But, I enjoin the people and officials of California to not seek the benefits of Federal policies of long standing without being prepared to abide by the rules of equity which are embedded in the traditional Federal policies.

This is a national problem which requires foresight and leadership. It also calls for firm adherence to the historical policies of multipurpose development and fair distribution of benefits under which the West has prospered in the past.

We will make progress on comprehensive development when there is adequate recognition of the public interest, and protection is given it without evasion or equivocation.

PERIL LURKING IN RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, repeated warnings from eminent scientists about the peril lurking in radioactive substances point up the need for coordination and consolidation of work in creating processes for effective disposal of atomic waste material. It is generally acknowledged that our information in this field is now only at the frontier-outpost point.

One of the principal objectives of the bill which I introduced last week for creation of a National Radiation Health Institute was to cope with this problem—to establish a governmental agency which can pull together the threads of research in disposal of atomic waste. Many aspects of problems connected with elimination of radiation hazards are discussed in an article in the *Wall Street Journal* of February 19, 1957. It reveals the scope of work which must be accomplished before human existence is safeguarded against rampant atomic particles. I ask consent to include the article in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENTISTS SPUR HUNT FOR WAYS TO DISPOSE OF NUCLEAR WASTES—OFFICIALS STUDY SALT DOMES, OIL WELLS, CAVES, AND THE OCEAN AS BURIAL PLACES

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—Congress' atomic specialists are about to join administration experts in a hunt for the world's biggest, strongest ashen.

This receptacle will have to keep millions of tons of dangerous nuclear waste out of

circulation for centuries. The hunt is produced by keen awareness of a harsh fact: Each particle of ash produced by burning atomic fuel is an arsenal of lethal rays which, in time, could wreck the world's population if not jailed and guarded.

The waste-disposal problem, Atomic Energy Commission officials say, will become prodigious as more and more atomic furnaces come into use to generate power and do other industrial jobs. These experts term it one of the major challenges to the industry.

A MAJOR FACTOR

A special team of AEC experts cautions that the future of atomic electricity may depend on a solution. It says: "Disposal of reactor and fuel wastes will be one of the major controlling factors in determining the extent of the use of power reactors."

Representative DURHAM, the North Carolina Democrat who chairs the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, agrees. But he's not pessimistic: "Look at the problems we've had in the atomic-energy field and solved already." As Mr. DURHAM sees it, the job is to find a practical solution cheap enough not to burden industry when it takes over waste disposal from the Government some years hence.

Today Mr. DURHAM's committee will open public hearings on a variety of urgent nuclear topics, including atomic waste. The group also will tackle such hot issues as whether Government construction of large-scale reactors is necessary, and what Government insurance is needed to protect reactor builders and operators in case of accidents.

But Mr. DURHAM believes the important waste disposal problem got short shrift last year in election-year scrapping between the AEC and some committee members over speeding up the atomic-electricity program. He intends to take a hard close look at what the Commission is doing in the disposal field.

"UNDER THE RUG"

Though atomic ashes are being taken care of adequately now, "we're merely sweeping the real problem under the rug," admits A. E. Gorman, Chief of the Sanitary Engineering Branch of the Commission's Division of Reactor Development.

Liquid wastes resulting from chemical reprocessing of spent reactor fuel present the major disposal problem. At Commission installations in Arco, Idaho; Hanford, Wash.; Savannah River, S. C.; and Oak Ridge, Tenn., some less dangerous wastes are buried in plain holes in the ground or in concrete-lined pits; this allows the radioactivity to "decay" or to filter through the soil. Other wastes are packaged, shipped out to sea and dumped. The deadlier material for the most part is put away in underground steel tanks.

But of this last method Mr. Gorman remarks: "We're only buying time. The radioactivity of the hottest waste," he adds, "is sure to outlive the steel tanks." Joseph Lieberman, AEC sanitary engineer, warns that burial places for even less deadly wastes are limited. He notes: "This problem is most pressing in the Northeastern United States where the only disposal sites are at Oak Ridge and in the ocean."

But AEC experts are confident the disposal problem can be solved in time to head off any slowdown in arrival of economically nuclear power. Says one: "We've got some good prospects of final solution under study."

As a prime possibility for getting rid of dangerous liquid wastes, Commission officials are doing research on pumping them into abandoned oil wells, underground salt domes, or other basins 5,000 to 15,000 feet below the surface, where the materials presumably could not contaminate drinking water or other natural resources. A special committee of the National Research Council has handed the AEC a report on this proposal that "looks encouraging," one official says.

This expert adds, however, that researchers must thoroughly explore whether this lethal material might work to the surface, despite its depth. "We need to know just what will happen to this stuff when we put it underground," he says. "Heat from the concentrated waste might spawn a radioactive geyser," the official adds.

A disposal method that looks practical and economical, according to AEC experts, is to lock the most dangerous wastes in a special clay called montmorillonite. The clay is shaped into spaghetti-like strings which soak up the hottest radioactive materials. The "spaghetti" then can be baked hard to seal in the radioactivity. The finished product can be buried in underground caves with no danger that water might unleash the radioactivity. A pilot plant using this method has been operated successfully at Brookhaven National Laboratory on New York's Long Island.

Researchers at the John Hopkins University laboratory in Baltimore are working on a somewhat similar idea: Fixing dangerous wastes in hard, synthetic crystalline minerals for burial.

A possible partial answer to the disposal puzzle may be to strip from highly radioactive waste its two most dangerous isotopes, or variations or elements, and use them as radiation sources for medicine and industry. This deadly pair is known as strontium 90 and cesium 137. Both can be used to provide radiation for X-ray photography or metals, for thickness gauges and the like. Cesium can help treat cancer and other ailments. The AEC claims the cost of this "dehorning" could be paid in part by sale of the isotopes. Without cesium and strontium, the wastes would be "a hundred times less hazardous" and possibly could be disposed of in the air, ground, and water, the AEC declares.

But the isotopes themselves, even after they lose their kick for industrial and medical uses, still must be put under guard.

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is working on stripping cesium and strontium from liquid wastes, also is developing a method of putting highly radioactive wastes, slurred with earthen materials, in a lined pit. The heat of radioactive decay forms the materials into masses without actually melting them—a process called sintering. But this leaves unsolved the problems of where and how to dispose of the masses and of controlling radioactive vapors leaving the sintering mass.

Already providing an ash can for token amounts of less deadly wastes, the ocean is being studied as a possible burial place for more lethal leftovers. A special committee of the National Academy of Sciences declared: "The only place on earth where disposal can be considered practical is the ocean."

There are sea-bottom hideaways, the committee says, where waste could be confined for centuries. In the deepest parts of the Black Sea, the "flushing time"—the period it takes for most of the deep water to move near the surface and be replaced by other water moving downward—is estimated at 2,500 years. The committee reckons it's "fairly certain" that substantial amounts of long-lived radioactive materials dumped in containers on the ocean bottom would stay isolated for more than 100 years and would become safely diluted.

Research work on ocean movements now is being done for the AEC by several United States institutions, including the Lamont Geological Observatory at Columbia University. As part of the International Geophysical Year starting next July 1, scientists of several other nations will cooperate to acquire data on the age and movement of the deepest waters.

The National Academy of Sciences panel says much more must be known about deep water ocean movements before the most

dangerous wastes can be dumped in the ocean. Mr. Gorman notes that the really deep spots where water will stay "stagnant" longest are limited. "This stuff will be around for centuries," he declares. "It might get out of control." If the material should escape from the deep holes, experts warn, it might be absorbed by fish, and if the fish should be eaten by humans, radiation would reach the vital organs even faster than by external exposure.

"We've even had the suggestion that we fly the stuff up to Greenland and dump it in the ice," Mr. Gorman says. But he adds that the idea has many drawbacks, "including the fact that we don't own Greenland."

Another AEC spokesman takes note of a suggestion that the waste be shot into space with this dry comment: "We're looking for a solution that is both feasible and economical."

As early as 1965, according to the National Academy of Sciences' special committee, spent fuel from the growing number of power reactors will yield more than 20 pounds of radioactive waste every day.

Mr. Lieberman figures highly radioactive wastes may amount to from 0.1 gallon to 5 gallons for every gram of uranium processed—a gram is less than 4 percent of an ounce. Some reactors take tons of uranium fuel.

"When one considers the generally extreme low maximum permissible concentrations of radioactivity in air and water, it becomes apparent there is not enough dilution available in nature to enable any practical, continuing dispersal of these wastes into the environment," he declares.

The pile of dangerous wastes is bound to multiply because there'll be no subtractions from it for a long time to come. For hundreds of years both of the most dangerous isotopes, strontium 90 and cesium 137, will give off many times more radiation than humans can safely stand.

As for the potential price of disposal, present costs may offer a clue. Underground burial of less dangerous wastes costs up to \$2 a cubic foot, the AEC estimates. The cost of stowing similar materials in an underwater grave is calculated as high as \$10 a cubic foot. Storage of the more potent liquid leftovers in the concrete-lined tanks runs up to \$2 a gallon, or about \$15 a cubic foot.

Cost, AEC officials say, is one overriding consideration affecting the final answer to the disposal problem. The cost of disposal is directly related to the cost of producing atomic electricity. Even a tiny variation in that figure, the experts note, can mean the difference between competitive and non-competitive nuclear power.

At present, waste disposal is the AEC's problem. Since 1950, Mr. Gorman estimates, the Commission has spent at least \$1 million a year for the sanitary engineering end of it. Counting related studies in the processing field, the cost might run two to three times higher.

However, it's clear that the AEC is looking for industry to lend a hand in running down an answer. Mr. Gorman declares the Government will help business with disposal problems resulting from the first generation of nuclear reactors now being planned or built. But he indicates that industry will be expected to play a large part in cracking the problem thereafter.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle

East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

COMMENTS ON SENATOR KNOWLAND'S ADDRESS
RELATING TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is with trepidation that I rise to make the comparatively brief speech I am about to deliver. I have waited some 9 days for a Senator with greater qualifications on this subject to make such a speech. In the absence of such an address, I have decided to present these remarks myself.

Before commencing them, I should like to say I addressed a letter to the Senator whom I am answering, so he would be apprised in advance of the speech I am about to make. I regret that important other duties undoubtedly have kept him from being present.

On February 11, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] delivered an address at Georgetown University on the subject "The United States and the United Nations." This address has been recognized as an important speech, not only because the Senator from California is the leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, as well as serving on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but also because he once again expressed certain criticisms and misgivings about the United Nations which are shared by a substantial number of people. These misgivings are reinforced by support from so influential a source. Moreover, the Senator from California is currently himself a delegate of the United States to the United Nations.

I do not have nearly the same length of experience as the Senator from California has, or the privilege of service on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have been hesitant, as a relatively junior Senator, to undertake the defense of the U. N., but I know that in the days since the Senator from California made his speech, the energies of many more experienced Senators have been concentrated on the President's plans for the Middle East. However, because I know that many thoughtful men and women in my own State are deeply interested in the United Nations and would be troubled by the Senator's criticisms, I have been concerned that they should not go totally undiscussed merely because our attention is presently diverted to the more immediate debate over the Middle Eastern crisis. My comments on the minority leader's speech of February 11 will not take up each of his detailed criticisms but will deal only with the key points of his attack, an attack designed to shake the faith of the American people in the value of the United Nations and to propose its destruction in its present form.

U. N. VETO ESSENTIAL FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION

The key of the Senator's attack was on the veto power of the permanent members of the Security Council, which has been used primarily by the Soviet Union to prevent United Nations decisions contrary to its own avowed self-interest. The key to his proposals is the expulsion, or the forced withdrawal, of the Soviet Union from the United Nations, so that the U. N. could be turned into an anti-

Communist collective-security organization.

Mr. President, in my opinion, this superficially simple and politically attractive scheme would hold great danger to the United States and to the world. It would destroy the present valuable functions of the United Nations which even the Senator from California recognized in his speech. Yet it would not bring us the goal of a more effective collective-security organization of the remaining members of the United Nations.

First, as to the veto. The so-called veto of proposed security actions granted the biggest powers was an essential aspect of the United Nations Charter when its structure was first developed at Dumbarton Oaks and earlier—and it is today. President Roosevelt and President Truman would never have contemplated a veto-free charter, and any such proposal would rightly have been rejected by the Senate. The Senator from California would have been the first to attack it, in my opinion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. For the record, I may say I can remember, as clearly as though it were yesterday, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, the colloquy which took place on the floor of the Senate on the San Francisco charter debate when the great Arthur Vandenberg was floor leader.

As the record will show, we discussed with him the veto question. Some of us raised a serious question then as to the wisdom of giving the right of veto to members of the Security Council.

Senator Vandenberg made it very clear to us that the delegates at San Francisco were satisfied that there would not have been Russian acceptance of the charter without the veto provision being in it. Then he made it crystal clear that there never would have been any acceptance by the American delegation without the veto provision in it. I think it is well that my colleague is bringing out, in this speech today, the indisputable fact that the veto was placed in the charter at the insistence of Russia and the United States at the time, and also at the insistence of delegations from other countries, I believe, although there was some opposition at San Francisco to the veto provision.

It is easy, though hindsight, to see the mistake which was made, with respect to which some of us had a fear at the very time. That is why we raised the question on the floor of the Senate in debate.

I wish to be the first to say that, after listening to the presentation by Senator Vandenberg, I acceded to the program. We were then still, of course, living in the hope that some of the pious pronouncements by Russia at the time could be relied upon, and that the veto would be used only in extraordinary situations, instead of becoming the rule which Russia almost invariably follows. When we seek to do something in the United Nations aimed at advancing the cause of freedom around the world, she vetoes it. She has a sorry record, time and time again, of following a course of action

which increases the possibility of war in the world.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I was not a Member of the Senate at the time the United Nations Charter was approved. At that time I was a Member of the House. However, I was very much interested in the subject. I listened to many of the debates, and read most of the others.

Some opposition was expressed to the provision in the charter whereby the veto power could be exercised by one nation. Personally I was very sorry the charter had been written that way. I remember very distinctly that three Members of the Senate voted against the ratification of the United Nations Charter. Quite a number of Members, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle, expressed gratification that there was the veto power, and indicated that they would not have voted for ratification had the veto power not been included.

So the statement of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is quite clear as to the attitude of many Members of the Senate at that time, particularly Republican Members.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am grateful to both the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Tennessee, who have made available to the Senate their greater experience than mine in this field. I realize that the senior Senator from Oregon was a Member of the Senate at the time the United Nations Charter was adopted. The senior Senator from Tennessee was then a Member of the House of Representatives.

It is extremely useful, in my opinion, for them to emphasize and underscore the fact that most people in the United States, and many Members of Congress, would not have tolerated a United Nations organization without the veto. They feared—and I think rightly so—an organization in which decisions could have been made which would have involved the commitment of American soldiers or other American action without the consent of the United States Government.

I wonder if the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] would support today—if only Russia were removed—a veto-free Security Council in which the United States could be bound by majority vote, lacking our right of veto, to take collective security actions without our own consent? Would he really suggest that the veto power would be unnecessary in the U. N. if only the Soviet Union were not a member? Or is it his position that the veto power in the Security Council is all right for those nations which need not use it, but it is bad when it is used consistently in the self-interest of a government which finds itself in a minority of one? In my view, Mr. President, nothing has demonstrated the isolation of the Soviet communism in world opinion more clearly than the repeated recourse of Soviet delegates to the veto to block otherwise unanimous U. N. proposals.

The widespread preoccupation with the veto among critics of the United Nations results from a false emphasis on the supposed significance of voting in the U. N., rather than on the actions of U. N. members. When these two are confused, neither the United Nations nor the cause of American foreign policy is advanced. It is not the veto of the U. S. S. R. in the Security Council which prevents effective international action against Russia's selfish interests, but rather the facts of Russia's size and power and aggressive Soviet determination, in the face of Western disunity and the failure of joint leadership of the free world.

REPUBLICAN LEADER'S PLAN WOULD DESTROY U. N.

Thus there could be no gain and much loss in the proposal of the Republican Senate leader to cut the Gordian knot of the veto by forcing the withdrawal from the U. N. of its chief user, the Soviet Union. Were this done, it would not change geography, or the relative military power of different nations, or their underlying economic strength and weaknesses and interests. Suppose Russia and its satellites withdrew from the U. N. or were expelled. Could we therefore expect greater cohesion or support for anti-Soviet policies from the remaining members? Rather, we should expect the very opposite. Before accepting the commands of the single-mindedly anti-Russian sort of organization which the Republican leader contemplates, scores of other members might also withdraw, including some of the most populous nations of Asia and probably several European democracies. The United Nations would disintegrate. For how would the reasons which persuade these governments to refrain from anti-Soviet alliances have been changed by Soviet withdrawal from the U. N.? Russia would still exist, in the same place, as large and powerful as before. Some of the most truly democratic and liberty-loving members of the United Nations are countries near the frontiers of Russia—gallant Finland, progressive Sweden, newly freed Austria. Could they remain in a United Nations without the U. S. S. R., a United Nations which then the Senator from California hopes would take anti-Soviet action? We in the United States are many thousands of miles from the storehouses of Red army artillery and atomic missiles—yet even we know ourselves to be endangered. The friends of ours whom I have enumerated, and others, are within virtual 20-20 vision of Soviet arsenals. How can the Senator from California expect them to accept the kind of United Nations which he plans—or does he contemplate, eventually, the same kind of a go-it-alone policy for the United States which his predecessors on the Republican side of the aisle assured when they tragically wrecked President Woodrow Wilson's League a generation ago?

LEAGUE OF NATIONS WAS DESTROYED BY ABSENT POWERS

When leaders of Senator KNOWLAND's party attacked the League of Nations and prevented American participation in it, they thought that by remaining outside the world organization, we could escape

from the world and from the consequences of our own growth to world power. Now the Senator from California attacks the League's successor—although it imposes on us less obligation than the League Covenant would have—and he asks us to eject from it our potential antagonists so as to escape from the consequences of their growth to world power. He has evidently learned little from our experience with the League. For Germany was a member of the League of Nations from 1926 to 1933, and left the League when Hitler took over and started plotting his course of aggression. Soviet Russia joined the League in 1934 in an effort to gain protection against the Nazis, and was expelled in 1939. By 1939, perhaps the Western European democracies could have got the League of Nations to adopt any resolutions they liked—but the League no longer resembled the real world. In the face of the actions of three powerful non-members—the infamous and cynical pact between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, plus American isolationism—the League of Nations system of collective security collapsed in the face of aggression. The world went up in flames—and we found that we had not escaped, after all.

Mr. President, a good many of the criticisms of the United Nations voiced by the Senator from California are undoubtedly valid, if they are directed to the United Nations as an agency of collective security. He is unquestionably right when he regrets that its friends oversold this view of it to the people of the United States. The United Nations was never designed to be a worldwide collective-security organization against any of the few large states so powerful that they could effectively mount a world war against the remainder of the organization. Such a notion would actually be self-contradictory, and the veto power given such large nations merely recognized that fact. The United Nations cannot be both a world organization and an anti-Soviet alliance, any more than an anti-American alliance or anti-British alliance. When we are disappointed at failures of justice or morality in international relations—as many of us have recently been disappointed in the contrast between the course of events in the Suez dispute and in the Russian oppression of Hungary—the failures are not those of the organization, but of the world which it only too faithfully reflects.

Yet in concentrating on his disappointment with these facts, the Republican leader virtually ignores that there is another side of the coin. He gives only the briefest mention to the fact that the United Nations has provided the sole forum on earth which presumes that potential belligerents will talk to each other rather than drop atomic bombs on one another's cities. Surely this alone justifies our continued support for the United Nations—unless there are those who think it would be better to stop talking and plunge into atomic war. The Republican leader's one-sided attacks on the weaknesses of the United Nations lead one to wonder why he is so intent on weakening the faith of the people of

America in the one international forum where debate may possibly forestall fighting.

SENATE, ALSO, HAS DISPROPORTIONATE REPRESENTATION

In attacking the distribution of votes and of financial burdens in the U. N., the distinguished Senator from California quoted with evident approval the criticism of the United Nations voiced by Lord Cherwell of England because "the population of the biggest is more than 1,000 times greater than that of the smallest."

Mr. President, if this is an indictment of the United Nations—as apparently the Senator from California and Lord Cherwell intend it to be—then it is virtually equally an indictment of the United States Senate.

Here in this Chamber 10 States which pay almost 73 percent of all Federal taxes are represented by a total of 20 Senators. Yet 38 States, which pay only 27 percent of Federal taxes, are represented by a total of 76 Senators. What does the Senator from California think of that discrepancy, if he supports Lord Cherwell's criticism of the United Nations because of the disproportionate size of the countries there represented?

Furthermore, the State of New York has approximately 65 times the population of the State of Nevada, yet each has the identical number of Senators in this body. Is the Senator from California thinking of indicting the Senate and its effectiveness on that basis? I hope not.

In addition, Mr. President, the United Nations has only the power to recommend, while we in this Senate have the power to enact laws which are binding upon 170 million men, women, and children. If disproportionate membership is bad for the United Nations, why does the Senator from California tolerate it—nay, actively support it—in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. President, as the common meeting ground of 80 nations, the U. N. has the instinctive confidence of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. They look to its meetings in New York with the hope that there the whole world will at least try to seek solutions to the problems which concern them most, problems which are different for each individual nation and which do not in every instance happen to include security from Soviet aggression. The prestige of the U. N. depends upon its inclusiveness and its accessibility to opposing points of view. We can and should make the democratic viewpoint prevail in the U. N. by virtue of leadership, not by expulsion of antidemocratic members.

UNITY AND LEADERSHIP BY FREE DEMOCRACIES NEEDED IN U. N.

I repeat, votes in the United Nations do not substitute for the actions of its members in assuring international peace and security. The Republican Senate leader is quite right that too often, recently, the Eisenhower administration has yielded to the temptation of presenting the U. N. as such a substitute for an effective American policy. When this course fails, it is not the organization's

failure—it is ours and that of other member countries.

The United Nations can be an effective force for liberty and democracy in the world when the free democracies join together in offering it firm leadership in support of those values. When we fail to maintain the unity of the free democracies, when we permit the West to appear divided and at cross-purposes, we can expect no successful collective action for liberty and democracy from the United Nations.

Thus I have often spoken of the importance of further developing the Atlantic Community.

We may rightly ask the United Nations to endorse actions which we are prepared to take ourselves in support of the principles of the charter. We cannot ask it to take such action instead of us. Let us always remember that the United Nations is not a court nor a parliament. It cannot act except by the action of its members. Yet when its chief members ask it to support their actions in the cause of international peace or security or justice, its endorsement, as the voice of the international community, can lend unparalleled prestige and righteousness to their cause. This, Mr. President, is a value for which the United Nations is well worth preserving; and that is why I believe that the Senator from California should have directed his criticism at the lack of leadership of the present administration rather than at the institution of the United Nations. For the latter he has offered no substitute besides anarchy and mutual isolation.

Mr. President, neither we nor many of the other nations of the world have yet fully learned, after only a dozen years, how to make responsible and consistent use of the institutions of the United Nations in relation to our respective national policies. The recent crises highlight these inadequacies. But I do not agree that we should write off a great international organization because of them. Long after the crises have passed I want there to remain a United Nations organization in continued existence. If the faith of Americans in the U. N. is destroyed by attacks such as those of the Republican Senate leader, then the United Nations may disappear as an effective potential instrument for world peace and for closer international cooperation in many fields.

A Senate may fail the public interest, a court may render a decision we detest, a United Nations may prove unable to solve a world crisis between powerful antagonists, but we do not propose their destruction as human institutions. A United Nations as contemplated by the Senator from California will not be a United Nations at all. He would destroy it in an effort to turn it into an armed camp, confronting another camp equally armed with the deadliest weapons in all history. I believe Americans want a United Nations in which we can talk with our possible foes—and in which we and they can present our respective cases to the world, and the world its problems to us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the speech he has just made. It is very important that we start to make the record here in the Senate in reaffirming our support of the United Nations. I am very much concerned by what is happening across the country as the result of the propaganda which seems to be abroad in the land about the so-called ineffectiveness of the United Nations.

I especially point out to my colleague, in support of his speech, that one of the reasons the United Nations is not so effective as we would wish it to be is, as my colleague points out in his speech, the failure on the part of the leadership of this administration to do those things which would strengthen the United Nations by constantly going around the United Nations and constantly circumventing the United Nations.

The record of this administration has been to go around the United Nations time and time again instead of first going through it. We ought to be carrying the fight to Russia within the United Nations by one resolution after another, to show very clearly that we are willing to submit to the procedures of the United Nations for the settlement of disputes.

We ought to be urging the use of U. N. procedures to settle international disputes but, time and again, we allow Russia to succeed in her propaganda without introducing a resolution with respect to the subject. If we did so, we would show Russia up for what she is—a designing nation intent upon dividing and ruling the free nations of the world. We have only to look at the mess the administration has created in the Middle East for proof of my statement.

We are now hearing talk in America about applying sanctions against one of the weakest nations in the United Nations and the only truly free nation in the Middle East. I think the time has come to take the debate to the President on this matter, and carry it across the Nation. I understand the President will make an appeal to the people tonight in regard to the sanctions issue. I think he should be met on that issue, because where have there been any proposals before the United Nations for the exercise of sanctions against Russia, when Russia has been violating the spirit, the intent, and the letter of the United Nations Charter? We now see the only free nation in the Middle East struggling for its survival, and what does the President want to do? Apparently, to accept the deceptive language of the Secretary of State in regard to Israel.

I wish to say to the President of the United States, "Come forward, then, and give us a concrete proposal as to what you intend to do to protect the survival of Israel. What arrangement did you make with the King of Saudi Arabia? Are you ready to tell the American people, or are you going to continue to keep it in the dark?"

I think the time has come to tell the American people what, if any, deal the President made with one of the out-

standing totalitarians of the world today, that absolute monarch of Saudi Arabia who has said he is willing to sacrifice the lives of millions of Arabs to wipe Israel off the map.

It is a little late to be telling Israel to follow a course of action that once again will throw her open to the danger of Arab attacks. There is no guaranty that she is to have the use of the Straits of Tiran. There is no guaranty that her ships are to be able to move in international trade. The time has come for the President not to speak in general language. I would say to the President of the United States, "Mr. President, what do you propose to do to protect the freedom of the only free nation in the Middle East?"

Here again, we ought to be going through the United Nations and be calling upon the free nations within the United Nations Organization to make it clear that we do not intend to stand by and permit the only free nation in the Middle East to run the danger of not even surviving, while the President and the Secretary of State talk about sanctions against the weak little nation we know as Israel, but which, nevertheless, is a nation which has been willing to bleed for freedom in the Middle East while the United States has followed a course of action which for months has weakened the position of Israel in that area.

When I offered an amendment and sought to get from the Secretary of State a statement as to some commitments for the preservation of Israeli rights before we adopt the Eisenhower doctrine, what was his reply? He said, "We cannot do that. We have to do it through the United Nations. This is only a resolution directed toward Russia."

But the time has come for Israel to ask the United States. "What about us? What protection have we any right to rely upon in view of the negotiations which the United States has been making with Arab countries which time and time again have issued the public threat that they intend to wipe this little nation off the map of the world?"

Mr. President, here is one Senator—let me say to the President of the United States—who does not propose to vote for sanctions against the only free nation in the Middle East. Let the President of the United States announce a concrete program which will guarantee, through the United Nations, the preservation of the freedom and the integrity of Israel. Here is one Senator who is not going to vote for any more unilateral action on the part of the President of the United States in the Middle East. It is about time the American people told the President of the United States that he, too, as well as the Secretary of State, should start action through the United Nations. No more of these deals with Arab countries. I would have my country return to that immutable principle laid down by the great Woodrow Wilson when he pointed out that permanent peace in this world has hope of being attained only if we reach international understandings by way of open covenants openly arrived at.

I want to know what covenants the President of the United States is making in the Middle East before I vote for any such blank-check authority as that which is being asked for in the Eisenhower doctrine.

At a later time, today or tomorrow or the next day, I intend to discuss at some length this doctrine; and, let me say to the leadership of my party in the Senate, the resolution they have adopted in the committee is not good enough, because it is only one step. It does not go to the essence of the problem. It does not begin to meet the constitutional question involved. It certainly does not even touch upon the great issues which are affecting peace in the Middle East, such as the Suez Canal, the Arab refugee problem, and the territorial integrity of Israel.

I am going to vote no authority to the President of the United States by way of a blank-check resolution until we come to grips with those three problems.

Before this debate is over I shall offer each one of my amendments to the resolution and ask for the approval or disapproval of the Senate. I surmise they will be disapproved, but we have days of debate which can go out to the whole country. Let the people understand what the issue is about.

Mr. President, I was in California last weekend, and I saw demonstrated in a series of meetings what I am satisfied is great grassroots concern about the President's program. I spoke in the Kern Theater in San Francisco last Friday night. I was quite surprised that 90 cents admission was charged, and the theater was packed with 2,000 people, not because I was the speaker, but because the subject which was announced was the President's doctrine in the Middle East. Those 2,000 persons were greatly concerned about the request of the President of the United States.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate think we should have a quick debate and close it speedily. I want to say that the longer this debate lasts, within rules of reason, the greater service we shall be performing for the American people, because the American people are entitled to have time to consider the facts which will be brought out in the debate.

Here is one Senator, may I say to the Democratic leadership of the Senate, who thinks the language of the resolution does not begin to even scratch the surface of the great issues which are involved. I shall no more vote for the resolution as now phrased than I shall for the original Eisenhower resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on the remarks he has just made. He cross-examined me at great length when I appeared before the joint meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee in support of certain amendments which I offered to the original resolution. The amendments were designed to make it clear that the grant being made by the reso-

lution would be a grant under the Constitution of the United States. It seemed impossible for me to believe that anyone would refuse to support an amendment of that kind. Yet, it does not appear in the resolution as it has been reported. This afternoon, shortly after the Senate began its session, I offered two amendments upon which I shall attempt to speak later on.

I think they are worthy of mention at this time, because they will appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning; and I should like those who read the RECORD to know where the amendments, if they are adopted, will appear in the joint resolution, and what they will do.

If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] will be so kind as to indulge me, I shall refer to page 4 of the resolution as reported by the two committees with the recommendation that the Senate act favorably thereon. The first sentence of section 2 reads as follows:

The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance.

Is the phrase "military assistance programs" defined in the resolution? Is it defined in the report? It is not defined anywhere. Anyone who can read the English language must know that under the phrase "military assistance programs" there could be included the utilization of the Armed Forces of the United States because that would be military assistance. If the President under this language chose to expand his authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces without the consent of Congress, it would be difficult indeed for Congress to stop him after he had put the Armed Forces into action. This is one of the vague portions of the resolution which must be cleared up.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator from Wyoming believe to be sufficient the President's statement, which he has repeatedly made, that he would be in hourly communication with the Congress and would consult with the Congress in all details of action under the resolution before taking action?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator in his question is trying to relate this matter to one single individual. I am not mentioning a name. I am talking about the office of President. It is the office of President which is mentioned in the Constitution. No names are mentioned in the Constitution, nor could they be mentioned.

Mr. BUTLER. But it is always within the power of Congress to withdraw the authority granted in section 2 if it does not want it to be lodged in the hands of a particular President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is always possible to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. I want to lock the barn door now, before there is any theft.

Mr. BUTLER. Would the Senator have the section provide—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will indulge me, I will tell him what I want the resolution to provide. It will take me only a minute to do so; then the Senator can interrogate me with greater knowledge.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming permit me to make one observation concerning the question asked by the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the Senator from Oregon will have me in trouble with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MORSE. Very well; I will withhold my observation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read the second sentence of section 2:

Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East.

Of course, that is a pious wish. We do cherish the hope, as vital to the national interest and world peace, that the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East will be secured. But this is merely a statement of a hope.

Now comes a statement of the means by which to fulfill that hope. I read sentence 3 of section 2:

To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

Now listen to the proviso:

Provided, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

If the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States is to be consonant with the Charter of the United Nations, it will be consonant with a charter which provides for the establishment of the Security Council, upon which Soviet Russia sits with a powerful veto.

So section 2—and I draw this to the attention of the Senator from Maryland—as it is presented to the Senate by the committees tells Congress and tells the people that the use of the armed services of the United States may be prohibited by the Soviet Union. Who in this body is willing to give his support to such vague, indefinite language?

I wish to make the purpose clear; so, Mr. President, I have offered an amendment on which I hope the Department of State will make a report. The amendment would strike out the words "Charter of the United Nations," and would substitute in lieu thereof "Constitution of the United States."

The proviso would then read:

Provided, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States—

The Charter of the United Nations was established by a treaty, of course—and with the Constitution of the United States.

How can we think for a moment of sacrificing the authority of the Constitution of the United States? We know

that throughout the Middle East there are small governments, such as those of Ethiopia, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, all of whom are members of the United Nations, and we propose under the resolution as it was reported from the committees, to give any one or all of them, including the Soviet Union, the opportunity to act under the Charter of the United Nations and to undo the Constitution of the United States?

I do not believe that any person who will give 10 minutes of concentrated thought to the meaning of the resolution which has been reported by the committees can fail to support the amendment I have proposed, which names the Constitution under whose provisions we sit here. If we are unwilling to name the Constitution, how did we have the courage to take the oath to support it?

If the United States is to maintain moral leadership in the world, and is to protect political liberty and economic liberty among men, we must stand by the Constitution, which is the first and only document ever written in the whole history of the world that guarantees to the people self-government. We will throw the Constitution lightly away, toss it aside, if we refuse to write into the resolution proper reference to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, does the Senator from Maryland now wish to interrogate me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to remind my distinguished colleagues, whom I thank for their cogent observations, that I have the floor, and that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has requested the floor after I have finished with my remarks. With his indulgence, I will be willing to yield extremely briefly, if the colloquy can be terminated in a relatively short time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, since the Senator from Oregon has been kind enough to indulge me, let me then state the meaning of my second amendment. Many other amendments could be offered, but section 3 of the resolution as reported is the one which deals with economic and military assistance under the joint resolution.

Section 3 provides, in part:

The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed \$200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the provisions of such act.

If I am correctly advised by the members of the two committees who sat through their executive sessions, the committees have never received from the administration any explanation whatever as to what programs have been conceived for the expenditure of the \$200 million. On the other hand, we are told that at high-level press conferences which have been held, those who attended the conferences were advised that \$50 million of the \$200 million would be used for the purpose of providing military equipment to King Saud, of Saudi Arabia.

Then there is some rather vague language in the further proviso beginning in line 25, as follows:

Provided further, That obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations for military assistance, and obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations other than those for military assistance. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations. None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until 15 days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use—

And so forth. I seek to amend that by inserting in the sentence—

None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used—

The following words—

for either military or economic assistance—

And then the committee amendment continues—

until 15 days—

And so forth. I seek to have that amendment made in the committee amendment because from this proviso in section 3 it is not clear precisely what the additional authorization is intended to mean. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations. I seek to make clear that the appropriate committees of Congress shall be advised before any assistance, military or economic, is extended. That merely will carry out the promise that the President of the United States made in his message of January 5, and surely there can be no objection to that.

Now I am at the command of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I thank him very much for having permitted me to explain my amendments.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to thank the Senator. Let me say that at the time when the amendments are submitted, I shall address myself to them. In view of the existing situation, I shall wait until then.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the speech he has made today, because it points the way in regard to the proper relationship of the United States to the United Nations. That is most important, because the relationship of our country to the United Nations is, I think, rather fundamental to the consideration of the so-called Eisenhower doctrine.

If my colleague will permit me to do so, I should like to ask several questions of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. My first question is this: Is it not true that the President's speech in which he said he would maintain hourly contact with the Congress, is not a part of the joint resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly it is not a part of the joint resolution, nor is it a part of the report on the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Wyoming aware that when, in my examination of the Secretary of State, I proposed an amendment which would require the President to come before the Congress and obtain the approval of Congress before he sent American forces into action in the Middle East, if that became necessary under the joint resolution, or, if the emergency then existing were so great that he could not wait for the 20 minutes that are required to travel from the White House to the Capitol, to report to us, or that he could not wait for the 24 hours that are sufficient in order to convene a special session of Congress, that the President be required to come before the Congress and report his reasons for following that emergency course of action, for our approval or rejection, at that point the Secretary of State said, in effect, that he wanted none of such an amendment—although only a few minutes before he had assured the committees that the President would keep in hourly contact with the Congress? Is the Senator from Wyoming aware of the position of the Secretary of State in regard to that amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not aware of it. However, knowing the position of the State Department in regard to my amendments, I am not at all surprised that the Secretary of State had an adverse reaction to the amendments of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say, as my last observation on this matter for the time being, that my amendments to the amendments of the Senator from Wyoming—which I completely support, and for which I shall vote—were offered in the committees as a substitute which in essence included the Senator's amendments. But the committee did not want them, as the Senator from Wyoming knows.

I wish to say that the amendments we are submitting, and for which we shall vote, not only protect the power of the Congress and not only protect the principle of the precious checking power of the Constitution, but also strengthen the Office of the Presidency.

I am at a loss to understand why the Secretary of State, purportedly speaking for the President of the United States, does not embrace the amendments the Senator from Wyoming and I are offering, so as to make clear to the American people that the President is perfectly willing to submit to the Congress his request to send American forces into action on the basis of conditions then existing or on the basis of the particular situation then existing, or that he agrees that if time does not permit that, he will come before the Congress forthwith and will report his course of action, for either the approval or disapproval of the Congress. Until the present President or any other President is willing to abide

by the spirit and intent of the Constitution, under article I, section 8, I will never vote him the kind of power he is requesting in the pending joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I glory in the courage of the Senator from Oregon. I know he will never surrender, and that his voice will ring in this empty Chamber until it is heard throughout the length and breadth of the land.

But I say to everyone in the gallery who may be listening that we cannot possibly make the United States the moral leader of the world on behalf of freedom for all peoples if we surrender the Constitution of the United States; and the rejection of my amendments would mean only that—namely, the abdication by the Congress of its constitutional power; and that, in turn, would mean the death of democracy.

I thank the junior Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very penetrating remarks.

Mr. President, I raised the issue of the attack on the United Nations by the minority leader because, regardless of its faults and defects, the United Nations is the only world organization we have in which potential belligerents can talk, rather than fight and drop nuclear weapons upon each other's communities.

I felt that the February 11 speech of the Senate Republican leader was one which could only undermine the faith of Americans in the United Nations. It seems to me important that some Member—regardless of his experience or lack of experience in the Senate—should answer that speech. I have attempted to do so today because it is my hope, and I believe it is the hope of millions of other Americans, that the United Nations will survive the faults of our world, and will remain the great truly worldwide international forum it is.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MR. AND MRS. ROCK HUDSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, about 3 weeks ago, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] presented to the Senate a former minister from Marietta, Ohio, who later became Colonel Hess, who is the one who airlifted more than a thousand Korean children to an island, so that they might find sanctuary there when the Communist troops came in.

Those exploits have been filmed in a great motion picture called "Battle Hymn"; and the star of that film, who comes from Illinois, is in the gallery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the rule, that I may present Rock Hudson, the star of "Battle Hymn," and Mrs. Hudson.

(Mr. and Mrs. Hudson rose and were greeted with applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). The Chair wishes to extend the greetings of the Senate to Mr. and Mrs. Hudson. We hope their stay in Washington will be informative and rewarding.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have been privileged to attend the hearings on the pending resolution, both the open hearings and the closed hearings. As a result of what I heard, I am unable to vote for the Middle East resolution for two reasons.

First, I cannot reconcile a vote for the Middle East resolution with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

Second, I cannot reconcile a vote for the Middle East resolution with a proper observance of the responsibility devolving upon the Congress under the Constitution of the United States.

Members of Congress were astounded, a few days before the present session of Congress convened, by matters released to the press—leaked deliberately, I say—to the effect that a great, new, bold doctrine for the Middle East had been evolved by John Foster Dulles, and that it would be necessary for Congress to put that doctrine into immediate effect because of the great emergency existing in the Middle East. Some of the press dispatches even went so far as to suggest that any Member of Congress who dared to exercise his own intelligence, and determine for himself whether this new doctrine was wise or foolish, would be lending aid to the Communists.

I do not know whether the releases to the press were intended to accomplish such a purpose, but they were certainly calculated to place the Members of Congress over a barrel and make them adopt the new brain child of John Foster Dulles, regardless of whether they thought it wise or foolish.

We might as well realize the facts of government along with the facts of life: While the doctrine is called the Eisenhower doctrine, it is the brain child of the present occupant of the office of the Secretary of State.

When we got into the hearings we made some discoveries that were totally inconsistent with the releases which had been given to the press. We found, for example, that the Middle East resolution announcing the new doctrine was not, in fact, directed toward the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We found that out because the Secretary of State himself testified that there was nothing to indicate that Soviet Russia was preparing to make any armed attack upon any of the nations of the Middle East. We found that out because Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified, in substance, that there was nothing to indicate that Soviet Russia was about to make any armed attack on any nation of the Middle East. We further discovered, Mr. President, from the testimony produced before the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, that there is, in fact,

no basis for the assertion that there was an emergency demanding that Congress should immediately swallow the Middle East resolution, lock, stock, and barrel, without investigating it and studying it.

The resolution has two alleged objectives. One is to authorize the President of the United States to use the Armed Forces of the United States in the Middle East.

I thought, from what I read in the press, that it was necessary for us to send our Armed Forces immediately to the Middle East to garrison the Middle East. So I asked the Secretary of State if it was planned, under the resolution, to station ground forces of the United States in the Middle East, and the Secretary of State replied, in substance, that there was no plan to station ground forces of the United States in the Middle East.

He went so far as to suggest that the Navy was in the Mediterranean, and that the Navy might take care of the situation. I thereupon observed, in substance, that I could not visualize the Navy sailing around on the sands of Arabia. Then the Secretary of State said that if any emergency should arise requiring the use of ground forces of the United States in the Middle East, the troops would be brought in from some other places on the face of the earth.

It strikes me that if we are to have time to bring in American ground forces from some far distant corner of the earth in case some emergency should arise demanding their use in the Middle East, we might have time to let Congress, which is sitting here in Washington, and which will be here until July, August, or September, act on this matter in an orthodox and constitutional manner.

Then the Secretary of State said, "It is necessary that the Congress release immediately from all restrictions \$200 million of President's appropriation so that it can be spent in the Middle East." I think every member of each of the two committees tried to find out from the Secretary of State how he wanted to spend that \$200 million. He told them that he did not have any plans as to how it was to be spent. I do not know how other Members of the Senate may feel; as to this, I cannot forbear observing, however, that when any official or private individual comes to me and tells me that there is a great emergency which requires him to have some amount of money which he can spend in a foot-loose and fancy-free manner, and also tells me, at the same time, that he does not know how he is going to spend it, he fails to satisfy my intelligence that he needs the money.

So I say that the evidence before the two committees which considered this resolution wholly failed to establish that there was any reason which would justify the Congress in passing the resolution as an emergency measure as the original press report suggested it should be passed, either from a military standpoint or from a financial standpoint.

I have alluded to the fact that the testimony of the Secretary of State himself, and the testimony of Admiral Radford, establishes beyond any question that this resolution is not directed at

Soviet Russia. I think every intelligent being knows that if Soviet Russia were to make an armed invasion of the Middle East, that act would be the signal for the beginning of the third world war, without any resolution of any character being passed by the Congress.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the testimony offered in support of the resolution makes it so plain that he who runs may read and not err in so doing, that this is a resolution advocated by the Secretary of State for the purpose of making the United States a policeman for the countries of the Middle East. We have had in our foreign policy in that area appeasement. We have had in our foreign policy in that area foreign aid. This resolution would not, on the one hand, put an end to appeasement, or, on the other hand, accomplish anything worth while in the foreign aid field that is not authorized by acts of Congress which appropriated approximately \$750 million for use in this area of the world during the present fiscal year.

There is no necessity for untying these funds. According to the evidence the Secretary of State already has \$95 million which he can spend in a footloose and fancy-free manner in that area of the world, and he does not even know how he wants to spend the \$95 million he now has.

I have said that I could not reconcile a vote for this resolution with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys. On this point, let me say that the Senate might as well realize what it is doing if it passes this resolution. It is appointing the present Secretary of State as its unlimited agent in the Middle East.

I have known another person who wanted somewhat similar unlimited power. In my hometown in North Carolina, there used to be two gentlemen who trafficked in mules. One of them was named Bob Goodson and the other was named Vance Powell.

Occasionally they would engage in a joint venture in the buying and selling of mules. On one occasion, Vance Powell came into my law office and said, "Six months ago I went over to Tennessee and bought some mules for the joint account of Bob Goodson and myself, and Bob Goodson has never ceased to complain about the traits of some of the mules I bought on that occasion."

He stated further, "Bob Goodson came to see me yesterday, and wanted me to go back to Tennessee and buy some more mules for him and myself. I told him I was not going to do it unless I could get a paper fixed up to protect me against him in the future. So I have come to you to draw me a paper which says these things, according to law: that Vance Powell is going to Tennessee and buy some mules for the joint account of himself and Bob Goodson; that Vance Powell is going to do as he pleases in buying those mules, and is going to exercise his own judgment in all respects; and that when he gets back to North Carolina with those mules, there is not going to be any 'hereafter' about any of them from Bob Goodson."

The Secretary of State is trying to get the Congress to pass a resolution ap-

pointing him as its unlimited agent, to do what he pleases, according to his own judgment, in the Middle East. If the Congress passes this resolution, it will have no right to have any "hereafter" about it, because it will be authorizing in advance everything which the Secretary of State does.

I have witnessed the activities of the Secretary of State in the Middle East. I have noted the fact that at the time he became Secretary of State, England, our ally, which has a peculiar interest in the Middle East so far as the Suez Canal is concerned, by reason of its mercantile activities, had 85,000 troops in the Middle East guarding the Suez Canal and keeping it open for the commerce of the world.

The Egyptians did not like that. They desired to seize the canal in violation of their agreement that the Suez Canal would remain in the custody of the Suez Canal Company until 1968. The Egyptians advised our Secretary of State that they did not like the English. To appease the Egyptians, the Secretary pressured the English into removing their troops from the Suez Canal, leaving it defenseless. A few days after the last contingent of British troops was withdrawn—exactly 13 days, as I understand—Colonel Nasser seized the Suez Canal. All of us are familiar with the subsequent events.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to yield at this point, or does he wish first to conclude his remarks?

Mr. ERVIN. I would prefer to finish my remarks; then I shall be very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

We are all familiar with the subsequent events, and I shall not detail them. They wound up with the United States voting with Soviet Russia in the United Nations against two of our most faithful allies, England and France.

I asked the Secretary of State, during the hearings, if we had not voted with the Soviet Union against two of our allies, and he said, "No; the Soviet Union voted with us." I remarked that that was a difference without a distinction, because the fact is, regardless of whose resolution it was, the United States and Russia voted for the resolution, which was, in substance, a verbal chastisement of our principal allies.

I do not know how the other Members of the Senate may feel about this matter. However, having observed the conduct of affairs in the Middle East by the present Secretary of State, and having observed the disastrous consequences of his conduct of such affairs, I do not have sufficient confidence in the soundness of his judgment to be willing to underwrite his future action in that area of the world with the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

I said that a vote for the resolution cannot be reconciled with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers. It is proposed in the resolution to initiate for the Middle East a new policy, under which the executive branch of the Government, acting through the International Cooperation Administration of the State Department, shall have

the right to expend the money of the American taxpayers at its uncontrolled whim and caprice.

I have been struck during recent days by the fact that the Federal income tax is rather burdensome. My church's catechism says that the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. The Federal taxing laws take issue with that statement of the catechism, because they attempt to make the payment of income taxes the chief end of man.

Persons in our lowest brackets are now paying Federal income tax at the rate of \$20 out of every \$100 of their income above a very limited exemption.

Yet we are asked to adopt a resolution which will commit us to the policy of extracting money from the pockets of our hard-pressed taxpayers for the benefit of nations of the Middle East whose rulers are receiving oil royalties aggregating hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

I believe that before it passes this resolution the Senate should investigate the possibility of having these oil royalties devoted to the use of the people of the countries of the Middle East.

Mr. President, there is another reason why passage of the joint resolution would not be consistent with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

There are in Europe 15 nations, having a combined total population in excess of 270 million, lying outside the Iron Curtain. These 15 nations are directly dependent upon the continued flow of oil from the Middle East for their economic welfare. The Secretary of State himself, during the course of the hearings, went so far as to describe the continued flow of Middle East oil as the economic lifeline of these nations.

Yet, notwithstanding the fact that these 15 nations of Europe are primarily dependent upon this oil for their economic salvation, the resolution puts the burden on the American taxpayers to insure the continued flow of this oil to those 15 European nations, whose combined population is largely in excess of that of the United States, without calling on them for the expenditure of a single penny to accomplish this task.

More than that, Mr. President, the joint resolution contemplates that Congress will underwrite the continued flow of this oil to these 15 nations having a combined population of more than 270 million, with the lives of all American boys of military age, without calling on the 15 nations of 270 million persons for a single one of their sons.

No one has given me a single sensible reason why the United States should be called on to pledge the resources of our taxpayers and the lives of our sons to continue the flow of oil to these 15 nations, which are not asked to do anything whatever in regard to the matter.

If Uncle Sam is unwise enough to assume the burdens which this resolution would impose upon him, it will not be long before some of the NATO countries will be tempted to say, "If Uncle Sam can carry burdens like those without our assistance, he can assume the entire responsibility of guarding us against any menace from the Soviet Union."

If we want to do something constructive in the Middle East, Mr. President, we do not have to assume the entire burden ourselves. We do not have to adopt the go-it-alone policy envisaged by this resolution. There are in that area now four nations—Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan—which have signed the Baghdad Pact to come to each other's mutual assistance in case of an attack by Russia. These four nations seal off the Russian border from the remainder of the Middle East. Not only are these four nations signatories to the Baghdad Pact, but the United Kingdom, as well, is a party to it. The five signatories have a combined population in excess of 170 millions. Yet, instead of allying ourselves with those 170 millions to secure the Middle East against Soviet aggression, we are asked to pledge that if necessary Uncle Sam will go it alone in defending that area of the world.

I asked the Secretary of State why he did not recommend that we become a signatory to the Baghdad Pact, and he said it would involve us in Arab politics.

When he was asked how he would spend the money which he would be authorized to spend under this resolution, he said he had no plans for it, but he did suggest one expenditure he could make, and that was that he might use some of it to strengthen the security forces of the nations of the Middle East against internal uprisings.

Mr. President, I submit that if the United States is going to attempt to maintain the status quo in the countries of the Middle East insofar as their present governments are concerned, Uncle Sam will be sticking his nose into Arab politics with a vengeance.

So much for the proposition that a vote for the Middle East resolution cannot be reconciled with a proper regard for the resources of American taxpayers and the lives of American boys.

I now wish to discuss my second proposition; namely, that a vote for the resolution cannot be reconciled with a proper regard for the function of Congress under the Constitution.

We lawyers are accustomed to use the axiom "Out of the facts, the law arises." By that we mean that we cannot tell what the law is until we know what the facts are.

This is true with respect to the war powers of the President and the Congress under the Constitution. As I have pointed out, all of the evidence produced before the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate concerning Senate Joint Resolution 19 left me with the abiding conviction that this resolution is not, in fact, directed against Russia. As I have further pointed out, world war III would automatically begin if Russia were to make an unprovoked armed invasion of the Middle East regardless of whether this resolution is passed or defeated.

The evidence presented to the committees discloses beyond all doubt that this resolution is directed against the countries of the Middle East. Under it, the United States is appointing itself a policeman for the Middle East to make the countries of that area stay at peace.

This is the object of the resolution and any pretense that it is directed at anything else is not supported by the evidence we had before us.

There are two kinds of warfare—defensive warfare and offensive warfare.

The only real protection the American people have on either the national or the international level is the protection afforded them by the Constitution of the United States. For this reason, I am unwilling to do anything which will, in effect, alter the Constitution of the United States without the consent of the Congress and the States—the only agencies authorized to amend it.

I do not claim to be an expert on the subject of the war powers of the President or of the Congress.

I have nevertheless given a lot of study to it. Such study has led me to the abiding conclusion that the power of the President as commander in chief of the Army and Navy under the Constitution when not acting by congressional authority is wholly defensive in nature, and that by virtue of its constitutional right to declare war, Congress and Congress alone has the power to authorize the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States in offensive warfare.

When this resolution is read in the light of the evidence presented before the committees, it clearly appears that the resolution is designed to permit the President to send the American forces into action on behalf of a Middle East country which is attacked by another Middle East country in case he decides that the latter country is controlled by international communism. This being true, the resolution is designed to permit the President to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to offensive warfare. We would delude ourselves, indeed, if we should say in such case that the United States were fighting in its own self-defense. An attack upon one Middle East country by another would not, in fact, imperil the national security of the United States.

For these reasons, I am unable to support any of the proposed amendments to the resolution declaring, in substance, that the President would have the right to engage in offensive warfare under these circumstances without authorization from Congress.

I have equal difficulty with the resolution in its original form. It undertakes to give congressional authorization to the President to engage in offensive warfare against some undesignated nation in the Middle East in case such undesignated nation attacks another Middle East country; and the President finds that such undesignated nation is controlled by international communism. When the people of the United States adopted the Constitution vesting in Congress alone the power to authorize offensive warfare, they contemplated that the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives should determine, in the exercise of their own judgments, whether sufficient justification exists for committing the Armed Forces of the United States to offensive warfare before they authorize the waging of such warfare. They did not intend that the Members

of the Senate and the Members of the House should abdicate their constitutional power and responsibility by delegating to the President the power to engage in offensive warfare at some subsequent time against some other nation to be selected by the President.

Mr. President, it has been suggested by some that this resolution is similar to the resolution regarding Formosa. The fact is that the distinction between this resolution and the resolution relating to Formosa is as wide, as broad, and as deep as is the gulf which yawns between Lazarus in Abraham's bosom and Dives in hell.

In the case of the Formosa Resolution, we knew who the enemy was. The enemy was Red China, which had committed aggression against us in Korea. We also knew that the armed forces of Red China were being massed on the mainland of China, and that they were firing on some of the islands, especially Matsu and Quemoy. We also knew that Red China had threatened to conquer Formosa, which was plainly within the line of our Pacific defenses. So in that case we knew who the enemy was. We knew that the enemy was preparing to make an invasion of Formosa, and we knew that Formosa was in the line of our Pacific defenses.

In this instance we do not know against whom a war is likely to be waged. We do not know whether there will be any justification for an offensive war. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State himself testified that there is not now a single country in the Middle East which is controlled by international communism.

So Congress is asked to pass a resolution authorizing the President to commit the Armed Forces of this Nation to offensive warfare at some future time against some nation not yet identified. In other words, we are asked to delegate to the President our constitutional responsibility of determining whether there will be any justification for offensive warfare in the Middle East at some undesignated time in the future. More than this, we are asked to delegate to the President our constitutional power to determine the identity of the nation against which the offensive warfare is to be waged. We are asked to do that at a time when Congress is in session, and when, from all prospects now apparent to us, Congress will be in session for months and months to come.

Holding these views, as I do, I am not willing to abdicate my function as a Member of the Senate and to let the President not only determine the sufficiency of the justification for offensive warfare at some future time in the Middle East, but also to select the nation against which such warfare is to be waged. Consequently, I cannot vote for the resolution.

If the administration wants to make it plain that the United States will not tolerate any unprovoked armed aggression by the Soviet Union in the Middle East or elsewhere, it ought to present a forthright resolution to that effect, calling the Soviet Union by name and apprising it in unmistakable language of that purpose.

For the reasons I have stated, I do not see how a vote for the joint resolution can be reconciled with a proper regard for the resources of the American taxpayers, with a proper regard for the lives of American boys, or with a proper regard for the responsibilities devolving upon Congress under the Constitution of the United States. Therefore, I shall vote against the joint resolution.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the gallery this afternoon are some 90 students from various high schools in the State of Rhode Island. They are here because of their interest in international affairs. We realize that while they are young today, they will be our elder citizens and leaders of tomorrow, and we are happy, proud, and privileged to have them as our guests.

The students have come to Washington under the auspices of the World Affairs Council of Rhode Island. They could not be in Washington at a more propitious time than when the Senate is debating Senate Resolution 19, which has to do with the conditions in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I respectfully ask that these young people be allowed to rise, so that they may be greeted by the Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Will the students from Rhode Island stand, so that they may be greeted by the Members of the Senate?

(The students rose in their places in the gallery and were greeted with applause, Senators rising.)

TRINITY RIVER—CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday I prepared some comments relative to a problem which is of primary concern to the State of California, which I have the honor, in part, to represent in the Senate. I wish to make those same comments now to the Senate.

As authorized by Congress, the Trinity River Division project in my State will be a multipurpose project, completely integrated with the Central Valley project, which itself is a public, multipurpose project approved by the people of California in the 1930's, and which was built by the Federal Government under Federal reclamation law.

The Trinity project was recommended by former Gov. Earl Warren and by Gov. Goodwin Knight as such a multipurpose development. In the Senate, in 1955, I sponsored the legislation authorizing the Trinity project, and my colleague, the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], cosponsored it.

In July 1955, Representative ENGLE requested the Senate to take up his House-approved bill by reason of the lateness of the session. It was similar to the Senate version, except that it provided also for a continuance of studies and a report to Congress by the Secretary

of the Interior on proposals for power development through the purchase of falling water at Trinity by a non-Federal agency, as a result of proposals made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Last week, pursuant to the study provision, the Secretary recommended a contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for the purchase by it of falling water and the installation of power-generating facilities at Trinity. Whether the Federal multipurpose development there and integration with the Central Valley project are now to be abandoned and the contract approved are, under the law, for Congress to determine. I shall discuss here only a few of the salient points on which he bases his recommendation.

The Commissioner of Reclamation in his report which is attached to the Secretary's recommendation states:

The all-Federal development assumes extending to the Trinity division policies and reclamation law which provide for sale (1) of power to preference agencies, (2) at lowest rates to all customers consistent with the financial needs of the project.

This is the basis on which the Central Valley project was built and upon which the Trinity project, now under construction, was authorized by Congress, all pursuant to Federal reclamation law in effect since Theodore Roosevelt's administration.

Preference agencies are nonprofit, public agencies which are given priority in the sale of power publicly produced by the Federal reclamation projects. Among the agencies in California presently exercising their preference with the Central Valley project and buying public power are municipalities like Sacramento and Roseville, the latter an atomic energy installation, various Army, Naval, and Air Force bases, and irrigation districts in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.

If the Secretary's recommendations were to be approved, his own Commissioner of Reclamation states that the power available to preference agencies would be curtailed; 650,000 kilowatts would be available to nonprofit agencies under Federal development, contrasted with 400,000 kilowatts under private development.

Under private development, the Commissioner finds that the preference agencies would be required to pay \$86 million more for power over a 50-year period than if Central Valley power continued to be available. If the proposed San Luis reservoir in the San Joaquin Valley were constructed, almost all preference customers would be required to look elsewhere for power. The Commissioner finds that they then would be required to pay a total of \$118 million more for power, of which Federal installations would pay \$71 million more, and State and local preference customers would pay \$47 million more. This is tantamount to emasculating the preference law so far as the Central Valley project is concerned.

Indeed, the Secretary himself recognizes this. In his letter of recommendation, he states:

I am not unmindful of the fact that acceptance of the company's proposal would

render it impossible to comply with two of the restrictions contained in the act. The first of these is the provision which requires that contracts for the sale and delivery of the additional electric energy available from the Central Valley project power system as a result of the construction of the plants authorized and their integration with that system shall be made in accordance with preferences expressed in the Federal reclamation laws. The second of these is the requirement that a first preference be given to preference customers in Trinity County, Calif.,—

And here I observe that that will be the site of the Trinity project—

to the extent of 25 percent of the additional energy added to the Central Valley project as a result of the construction of the Trinity River Division. Since joint development of the Trinity resource would add no energy to the Central Valley project power system, except to the extent that the company provides support under its proposed amendments to the existing sales and interchange contract, it appears that there would be no power from which to satisfy either of the two restrictions mentioned. The company's proposal would provide Trinity County with powerplant values to be added to its local tax base as an offset to its first preference position under all-Federal construction.

The 1955 report of the Senate Interior Committee on the Secretary's study accompanying the Trinity authorization bill, said on the question of the preferences law:

The proviso is in no sense to be understood as an authorization to waive, in any negotiation for the sale of falling water, any preference in the sale or transmission of power as expressed in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, or in any other law.

In reporting the Trinity bill, it was the intention of the Senate committee to preserve inviolate the preference clause sections of the reclamation laws, and to indicate that the study by the Secretary was not to be interpreted as approving any departure from the traditional policy which, as I have said, Theodore Roosevelt's administration laid down. That was precisely my intention in handling the bill in the Senate, and was, I believe, the intention of the Senate in passing it.

In my judgment, the Congress will not consider repealing the preference clause. At any rate, that clause will not be repealed with my vote. One does not need to be doctrinaire on power policies in order to recognize the right of people to determine the kind of electric service they desire for their community or their district, under preferences given to them by Federal law on Federal reclamation projects. With respect to Federal installations, long served by Central Valley project power, such as a Navy shipyard, an Atomic Energy Commission development, or Army or Air Force bases, it is illogical to urge that the Federal Government build a \$225 million project only to compel its own governmental agencies to pay private-power rates for the electric energy produced by the waters stored therein. Indeed, it would be illegal under the Trinity authorizing law.

There is another fundamental consideration to which I wish to allude. The

Secretary recommends that one segment, Trinity, of a vast, integrated reclamation project, be operated, so far as power production is concerned, entirely differently from the rest of the project. Here, in being, in the Central Valley project, is a whole integrated system of dams, powerplants, reservoirs, and canals, constructed by the United States, all designed to protect people and land from floods, and to benefit both through a dependable water supply for agricultural and domestic purposes. In paying for the cost of this immense undertaking, the people of the area benefit by the sales of electric energy which the system incidentally produces.

To expand its benefits, so as to meet the growing needs of our State for the right amount of water at the right time, the Trinity project was first a dream, and then a reality. From the very beginning, the California State government has urged the Federal Government to undertake its construction and to integrate it with the Central Valley project, with a specific recommendation for Federal generation of power attendant upon the release of waters from the new dam.

The Secretary's recommendation for private power development at Trinity is fraught with many perils.

The theory of California water law is one of beneficial consumptive use. Our semi-arid State cannot afford to waste water. In a Federal reclamation project, the Bureau of Reclamation must determine what is the most efficient use of the water in the storage reservoir for both domestic and agricultural use. That is the basis on which it must discharge its responsibility of administering reclamation projects. Beneficial consumptive use of impounded waters must have complete priority over their use for the generation of electricity. Under the Secretary's proposed contract, the single responsibility of the company would be to produce hydroelectric power in a manner most efficiently to supply the needs of its own customers. In the proper functioning of the Central Valley project, I visualize a deadly serious problem if the needs of water by the Central Valley were to conflict with the needs of electricity by the customers of the company.

The basic concept of the Central Valley project would be drastically altered, if not, indeed, destroyed, by the proposed contract. Suppose, in a period of water shortage, agricultural needs compelled the project to draw off water from the reservoir at a faster rate than that required by the company for power production. Apparently to resolve the resulting problem, the contract proposal would require the United States to pay a penalty to the Company for doing the very thing which the project was designed to accomplish. The basic purpose of the Central Valley project is storing and releasing water in the interests of irrigation and reclamation. That purpose is in the public interest, and the public interest requires that that purpose be fulfilled without imposing penalties on the Government of the United States.

There is room in California for both public power and private power to meet the growing needs of our growing State. I seek to encourage both. Where, as in the Central Valley project and the Trinity River, facilities have been created through an investment of public moneys, I believe that the power produced by them should be distributed to public agencies, as has been so successfully done for many years. The Central Valley project was not constructed for profit. It was built to satisfy an urgent need among our people for reclamation assistance. Its benefits should be distributed on as wide a range as possible.

When the Trinity authorization bill was before the Senate, I had, as I have said, the responsibility of presenting it and of urging its passage. At that time, I repeated to the Senate what I earlier had said to the Senate committee:

Personally I believe in this instance, since all other generating plants in the Central Valley project are federally operated, the Trinity plants should be also. But to permit careful study of the partnership possibility, the Engle bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to continue its studies and negotiations and report with recommendations to Congress in not less than 18 months. I approve of this provision, because it will give Congress a full opportunity to decide whether the Trinity powerplants should be federally or privately operated.

In the intervening months I have repeated that statement to the people of California many times. That is the position I have taken in the public interest. And I am supported in that belief by the similar position which two Governors of California and their administrations have taken on it.

I am supported, too, by the vote of the people themselves in approving the Central Valley project with their votes in the 1930's. I have studied the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior. I realize that each Member of Congress must make his decision as he sees the light. I have made mine. I disagree with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior. They do not serve the interests of the people of California. I cannot and will not support them.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate in the Senate with respect to the President's proposals on the Middle East. The President of the United States desires peace. So do the people of the United States. And it is in the interest of peace that Dwight Eisenhower is making his recommendations to the Congress.

I recall sitting in the Senate a little over 2 years ago when the President made his recommendations with respect to Formosa. At that time he asked the Congress to confirm in him the author-

ity to commit the armed might of the people and the Government of the United States to prevent Communist aggression in the Far East. A direct hazard to the security of the American people was involved. The Congress responded, and it responded overwhelmingly. Senators on the other side of the aisle, as well as those on this side, took the lead in urging approval by the Senate of the recommendations the President had made as contained in the so-called Formosa Resolution. After the adoption of that resolution, the Government of the United States stood united before all the world. I wish to submit, as my sincere and well-considered opinion, that the action of the Congress in adopting the Formosa Resolution went a long way toward deterring Communist aggression in the Far East and toward preventing war in that area.

I see the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has returned to the Chamber. In his comments earlier today he suggested that he had made a speech in California a few days ago in the presence of a number of Californians, and he used that as an instance as the basis for his asseveration that there was a grass-roots movement across the country in opposition to the President of the United States and his recommendations with regard to the Middle East. I deny that. In denying it, I desire to say that, in my judgment, the overwhelming majority of the people of California know that the President of the United States earnestly and prayerfully works for peace. In the interest of the security of the people of the United States and of a just and enduring peace in the world, he has made recommendations to the Congress which I propose to follow.

I recognize full well that Congress, as has been stated on the floor many times, is a coequal branch of the American Government. I recognize full well the responsibility of the Congress to discharge its coequal responsibility, as it is indeed doing today, as it did yesterday, and as it will continue to do until finally the great majority in the Senate will follow the great majority in the House of Representatives in taking a stand before the world to demonstrate what we believe is in the interest of American security, and in advance indicating what we intend to do. Amendments to the original text may well be adopted by the Senate. I completely approve of some. But, basically, we will approve what an American President has proposed.

To his credit, the candidate of the Democratic Party for President in the last election stood in Los Angeles yesterday and said he would support the President if he were a Member of the Senate. Earlier, the distinguished former President of the United States, Mr. Harry Truman, did likewise.

I am not a member of the Senate committees concerned with the pending legislation but I have read the earnest, forthright recommendations of many great Americans, like Gen. Alfred Gruenther, urging that this country demonstrate its unity by congressional approval of the Presidential recommendations, and it has seemed to me that it requires very little prescience to

prophecy that in the case of the pending resolution, when it comes to a vote, there will be the same bipartisan acceptance of it as took place on the floor of the Senate in my earlier days here, when the Formosa Resolution was adopted, and as a result I believe we shall advance the cause of peace, not the cause of war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate at this time very long, but I should like to make a few further remarks about the pending resolution. First, I should like to compliment the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who spoke on the resolution just a few moments ago. The Senator from North Carolina made a fine contribution to the deliberations of the two committees sitting jointly on the resolution. I intended to ask the Senator some questions about his remarks a moment ago, but unfortunately, I was called from the floor, and the Senator from North Carolina completed his remarks before I returned.

I want the RECORD to show that in our committee deliberations, the Senator from North Carolina played a very prominent and constructive role, especially in regard to the constitutional aspects of the resolution. I think he clarified those aspects for the committee, and he deserves much of the credit for the improvement in the text of the resolution which was adopted by the committee.

There are one or two aspects of the matter on which I wish to comment at this time. First, I should like to make it clear that the overall objective of the resolution is perfectly acceptable to me. I had no objection to the objective of the President's policy as he stated it to the joint session of the Congress—that is, the policy of this country to resist expansion of communism in the Middle East by overt armed aggression. I would go further and say aggression by any other means should be resisted by this country. I objected to the form in which the proposal was submitted to the Congress. I have noticed that some newspapers and commentators ignore the questions of the form of the proposals. They pass over my objections and those of others who object to the constitutionality of this particular procedure.

I wish only to point out, as strongly as I can, that after all Government is largely a collection of procedures. The difference between the Government under which we operate, under the Constitution, and no government at all, is a group of rules which we agree to abide by. The Senate could not function at all without rules which we accept and abide by. Year after year the Senate spends a great deal of time on the interpretation and application of its rules. When responsible citizens, and especially newspapers, which are supposed to help the citizens of this country to understand great issues like this one, ignore the significance of the arguments relating to the constitutionality of this resolution, I think they are failing in one of their chief responsibilities to the people of the country.

Whether or not they agree that those of us who have criticized the procedure

followed are right, is one matter; but to ignore it and to say that this is nothing but partisan wrangling, as some leading newspapers have said, is in my opinion a disservice to the people, and I think it will cause trouble in the future.

My principal objection, as I stated at great length—and I shall not repeat the arguments—is to the constitutionality of the procedure, that is, undertaking to delegate by joint resolution an authority which I think inheres in this body and should not be delegated. Also, such an attempt to delegate authority would cause confusion with regard to the emergency powers of the President as I explained on February 11 on the floor of the Senate.

The other aspect of it which I think is a bad precedent for the future of this body and of our legislative process is the authorization of large sums of money without any restrictions or regulations whatever. I agree that we have done that on a minor scale in some instances in the past, but I think the degree in which it is proposed in this instance, and the manner in which the proposal is brought in, coupled with this other provision which is questionable on constitutional grounds, would create a precedent which would be very embarrassing to us in the future. I also think it is quite unnecessary to do this, in view of the existence of large sums of money now available in this area.

I wished to say a few words to clarify my position, and I think some of the other Members who have voted against the resolution or criticized it. We have all been motivated by the same considerations. That is to say, we are not trying to weaken the President, and we are not failing to support the overall objective of the President, but we insist that this kind of policy should follow a procedure which is well established, and about which there is no question.

I, myself, moved in the committee to change this resolution from a joint resolution to a concurrent resolution, which would cure the principal constitutional objection. That motion was voted down, much to my regret.

Now we are confronted with a resolution which, while still in the form of a joint resolution, embodies a change in the language delegating specific powers in the field of the warmaking power, so that it merely expresses a policy. That policy is much more appropriate to a Senate resolution expressing our advice and consent under the Constitution, than it is to a joint resolution undertaking to legislate.

So we have a strange combination. However, I must say that certainly on constitutional grounds the joint resolution is better than it was. I regret that this kind of confusion and difficulty has arisen in connection with such an important matter.

I can only say that we have the precedent of the Vandenberg resolution on the one hand, and on the other, the precedent of the Truman doctrine. President Truman was content to rely upon his statement to the joint session for the enunciation of the policy; and at a proper time later he brought in

a full-fledged authorization bill, which was comparable to our ordinary foreign aid bill, which will be before us, probably, in a few weeks.

I wished to say these few words to try to place in a little better perspective the reason why some of us have objected to this joint resolution, and still question the procedure which is being followed, because it tends to confuse the procedure which should be used in the future.

A PROGRAM FOR HEALTH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an exceedingly interesting and fine article which my able colleague from Oregon wrote and which was published in the February issue of *Eagle*. The article is entitled "Crash Program for Health." The article carries the sub-head: "We Spend Billions on Weapons. Why Not Finance a Full-Scale War on Cancer and Other Killing Diseases? Success Could Open Vast New Horizons for Man."

I should like to use the article written by Senator NEUBERGER as the springboard—shall I say—for calling attention to what I think is a great moral obligation of this session of Congress. I know there are those who think, when we start talking about moral obligations in connection with the responsibilities of a free government to a free people, that one somehow becomes abstract and highly theoretical and impractical.

To the contrary, when we talk about living up to our moral obligations in carrying out the responsibilities of government, we are talking, in my judgment, about the primary purpose of government. So many times I have said—and it cannot be said often enough—that the primary purpose of this Government of ours is to protect and promote the interests of our people, who make up the Government.

The people who make up our Government are not the officials of the Government. The people who make up our Government happen to be our entire citizenry.

When one talks about our moral obligations as a Government in respect to the health of the people of our country one is treading on very thin ice in some quarters. I am shocked by the extent to which powerful lobby forces have succeeded in convincing many people that the Government should follow a complete hands-off policy when it comes to the matter of the health of the American people.

There is a great job of educating to do on this subject. I hold to the premise that the American people are entitled to receive from their Government much greater protection and much greater assistance in the realm of public health than they are now receiving. I cannot remain silent in the Senate, and shall not, on this issue of the exercise of greater responsibility on the part of Government in doing what a Government should legitimately do in giving greater protection to the American people in the field of health.

It is Christian. It is moral. It clearly falls within the keystone clause of the

Constitution, to promote the general welfare of our people.

I have no intention now, any more than I had during the past 12 years, of worrying myself about political lobby forces which hold that it is to take the American people down the road to socialism to advocate legislation aimed at better protection of the health of our people.

This Congress, this year, in my judgment, should appropriate substantial increases in funds for greater research, for example, in the fields of cancer and heart disease, and all the other great diseases which plague the health of our people, and about which the medical profession knows so much, and yet, when all is said and done, so little, or perhaps too little.

I feel that there ought to be a co-operative arrangement between Government and those great men and women who work within the medical profession and allied professions, motivated as they are by great humanitarian impulses to help give greater service to the people of our country in the field of health.

Government has a role to play. I think that my colleague, in this very fine article, published in the *Eagle* magazine, entitled "Crash Program for Health," has outlined at least a segment of this problem with great clarity, and I now ask that it be incorporated in the *RECORD* at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

"CRASH PROGRAM" FOR HEALTH—WE SPEND BILLIONS ON WEAPONS; WHY NOT FINANCE A FULL-SCALE WAR ON CANCER AND OTHER KILLING DISEASES?—SUCCESS COULD OPEN VAST NEW HORIZONS FOR MAN

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, United States Senator from Oregon)

With one of America's most famous female radiologists at my side, I looked through the slit-like glass window which had been niched in concrete walls 30 inches thick. Beneath a great cone-shaped apparatus, a woman lay on a table. A bathrobe covered her body. The room was darkened. The tiny point of the equipment seemed to pick out her chest and throat. She was receiving radiation treatment from a "cobalt bomb" for deep-seated cancer. The mysterious roentgen rays made no sound.

Would the treatment be successful? Would it arrest the deadly march through her system of malignant cells? Would she survive?

These questions flashed across the innermost frontier of my mind. Another question lurked there, too. Would the woman on the table ever know a moment's peace or contentment again? During her entire life, be it long or short, could she ever spend a fleeting hour free of anxiety and terror? Would each twinge of pain mean that the fatal killer had returned?

The woman on the table was obviously younger than my wife or I. What if it had been one of us on that table beneath the cone—the cone from which came the unseen rays that might mean a reprieve, if only the malignancy had been detected in time? Cold drops of perspiration dotted my forehead as I harbored these thoughts.

And yet, I mused how little we actually know about the rampant behavior of cells and tissue which men call cancer. The "cobalt bomb" was not a certain cure, even though nuclear fission had made it possible. It was a hope—a faint hope, though nonetheless genuine. And as I stood outside the vault of concrete and lead where the rays

from a tiny inner cylinder of plutonium were working their mission which might mean life or death, I wondered why the richest Nation on earth was not investing more of its effort, resources, and wealth toward the possible liberation of mankind from cancer. Surely few battlefronts could be more crucial.

Cancer is a threat which hangs over us all from the bassinet to the tomb; yet we spend far less attempting to solve it than we do, for example, on the fittings for one aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class.

As the radiologist and I peered through the narrow window at the young woman on the table, few things loomed as important as cracking the terrible riddle of cancer. All else—politics, money, personal ambition—faded into comparative insignificance.

What America needs today is a crash program of medical research. It should be a program proportionate to the \$40 billion which we seem able to spend annually on weapons of war. What war, after all, can compare with that against cancer, heart disease, mental disturbances and other sinister maladies wracking mankind?

Mike Gorman, 43-year-old executive director of the National Mental Health Committee, points out that, despite its inadequate support from governmental appropriations, medical research during the past decade has added five years to the life expectancy of the average American. Translated into earning capacity alone, the people whose existence has thus been prolonged have paid seven times as much into the Treasury in personal income taxes as has been invested in the United States Public Health Service. And Gorman adds this further heartening note:

"In an age when the Communists and their satellites outnumber the forces of the free world by better than 2 to 1, medical research has bolstered our manpower resources and increased our productive strength. It has reduced immeasurably the tragic toll of human suffering."

Yet in the Congress, as well as the public at large, still think in pygmy terms with respect to combat against disease. Unhesitatingly, we will spend billions for tanks or battleships or bombing planes. By contrast, we are stingy with mere millions when sickness is the enemy, rather than a foreign foe. And when we contemplate that the United States Government is spending \$48 million on the National Cancer Institute as contrasted with \$10 billion on naval vessels, we must keep in mind that it takes \$1 million multiplied 1,000 separate times to mount up to just \$1 billion.

Nor was even the \$48 million investment achieved for the onslaught against cancer without persistent and tireless effort on the part of certain Members of Congress.

When I was a candidate for the Senate in 1954, few topics held audiences more attentive than my insistence that Federal expenditures for medical research generally—and in the field of cancer in particular—should be increased many times. I even proposed an ultimate outlay of \$1 billion for cancer research alone, if necessary. This statement was repeated by me at trade unions, civic clubs, Eagle Aeries, Grange halls, before veterans' groups, and women's organizations. It drew almost universal support and interest, especially when people learned that we were then spending \$63,980,000 on the Inter-American Highway and only \$24,978,000 on cancer research. Was greater knowledge of mankind's grimmest killer a mere 38 percent as urgent as the Inter-American Highway through distant jungles?

As a newcomer to the Senate, I have served as a private in the ranks of an all-out attempt to bolster our attack against the disease which is nearly the equivalent of a death sentence to all afflicted by it. Leaders in this effort were members of both major political parties—*LISTER HILL* of Alabama, *WARREN G. MAGNUSON* of Washington,

and *WAYNE MORSE* of Oregon, Democrats; and *MARGARET CHASE SMITH* of Maine and *EDWARD J. THYE* of Minnesota, Republicans. Encouragement was received from *CARL HAYDEN*, of Arizona, a Democrat, who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and has served in Congress ever since his State was admitted to the Union in 1912.

This bipartisan undertaking brought about the doubling of Federal funds available for cancer research at the National Cancer Institute, from \$24,978,000 to \$48,432,000.

As we worked to achieve this goal, I thought of the fact that man has learned to conquer the air, the waters under the sea, to ascend Mount Everest, and even to influence the weather under certain circumstances. But cancer remains the inexorable assassin. Neither wealth nor fame nor power can stay its ravages. It killed valiant *Babe Didrikzen Zaharias*, Senator *Arthur H. Vandenberg*, Senator *Robert A. Taft*, *John P. Weyerhaeuser, Jr.*, of the vast timber corporation, and many others who still had much to contribute to American progress.

Although a crash program of medical research into the ominous roots of cancer would come too late to prolong their lives, perhaps it might help to spare the cancer victims of a later generation—in our own country and elsewhere in the world. Mercy knows no national boundaries.

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, only woman Member of the Senate, effectively emphasized the disproportionate sums which we spend on frivolities and on grappling with the most dreadful diseases plaguing the human race. Senator *LISTER HILL*, chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee handling health funds, insisted that top salaries in Public Health Service laboratories be increased from \$15,000 to \$20,000 annually. "The productivity of any research organization depends upon the quality of the staff," said Senator *HILL*.

Furthermore during our discussion of health appropriations on the Senate floor, Senator *HILL* assured me that the increased funds for cancer research were not a goal in and of themselves but simply part of an onward march which must continue.

Partly because of the great impetus for an all-out program in the realm of malignant diseases like cancer, research expenditures by the Government for the fiscal year of 1957 also have been vastly expanded in other fields. The National Institutes of Health, located in Bethesda, Md., are now in the midst of their most active 12-month period. Note this contrast in all major classes of appropriations:

	1956	1957
General operating expenses.....	\$5,929,000	\$11,922,000
National Cancer Institute.....	24,978,000	48,432,000
Mental Health Institute.....	18,001,000	35,197,000
National Heart Institute.....	18,898,000	33,396,000
Dental Health Institute.....	2,176,000	6,026,000
Arthritic disease activities.....	10,840,000	15,885,000
Microbiology activities.....	7,775,000	13,299,000
Neurology and blindness disease activities.....	9,861,000	18,650,000
Total.....	98,458,000	182,807,000

Thus, United States Government expenditures for medical research have been increased 85 percent in 1 year. Even teeth and gums had participated in the advance. Yet is this disbursement enough?

In Washington, D. C., our residence has been next door to that of *Dr. Leonard A. Scheele*, a tall 49-year-old man, who recently retired as Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. One sultry evening, seated in our patio over coffee and cake, I asked my neighbor: "Leonard, what is probably the maximum amount of money which the National Cancer Institute could spend in 1 year for research and study, if given reasonable notice in advance?"

The Surgeon General pondered for a moment. "Half a billion dollars," he answered. "What would be the usefulness of that quantity of money?" I asked.

"You would be certain that you could carry on your program from year to year without delay or interruption," Dr. Scheele replied. "Your top doctors and scientists would know their continued employment, at fair and adequate pay, was assured. They would not be tempted to break off their work to enter lucrative private practice. In addition, you could follow every possible lead or hope, no matter how remote or elusive it might seem. You would not have to budget so carefully and pursue only the most promising discoveries. In a war, the military often overspends because it might be fatal to the country to underspend. We could do that in the area of cancer research if we had a billion dollars or even half a billion dollars at our disposal.

The sums which Dr. Scheele and I discussed may loom as fantastic. But are they? Americans spend over \$15 billion a year on liquor and tobacco. They even spend \$230 million for chewing gum and \$116 million for shampoos. Why not twice as much for cancer research as for gum?

Whenever I urge a vast increase in Federal funds for medical research, people invariably inquire about the sums raised for this purpose by voluntary agencies. "Don't they do the job?" is the perennial question.

The voluntary agencies do a magnificent job. In 1954, for example, the American Cancer Society collected \$21,670,000 in private contributions and the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund an additional \$1,751,000. Organizations such as the Eagles, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AFL-CIO, and others have helped generously toward this private total of over \$23 million. Yet only \$7,189,000 of the private donations were allocated for research. The rest had to go—and properly so—for the treatment of pitiful and agonizing cancer cases in families lacking sufficient financial resources for their care. It is obvious, therefore, that the Government must carry on the major responsibility in cancer research, or it will not be carried on at all.

Research into all potentially fatal diseases, and particularly cancer, is one avenue for liberating mankind from a grim fear and a painful reality. Should not our Government share in such a responsibility? We would scoff if some official in our town proposed that the fire department be entirely reliant on voluntary contributions. Yet which is the most imminent menace to the average person, fire or cancer? Ask a cancer sufferer.

Although I have been a legislator at both the State and national level, I still am unable to fathom the legislative mind when it comes to this vital human problem. Such famous Senators as Taft, Vandenberg, and Wherry have been fatally stricken by cancer. Yet the Senate will move with alacrity to vote \$4 billion for B-52 bombing planes, but it can cavil over barely more than 1 percent of this for cancer research. We will appropriate limitlessly to combat the foe we can visualize, whether it be the Soviets, Nazis, or imperial Japanese. But stinginess and hesitancy cloud the picture when the enemy is an insidious disease which strikes silently and invisibly, but nonetheless murderously.

As a member of Oregon's House of Representatives, my wife had to struggle for almost 4 months to persuade her colleagues to vote a trifling \$80,000 for pilot courses aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. The lack of trained teachers and classes for these unfortunate youngsters brings heartache to thousands of families. It also dooms the children to lives of public dependency and helplessness. Skilled teaching can enable them to read, to play happily, to feed themselves, maybe even to work at a trade. Yet Mrs. Neuberger, herself a former teacher

of physical education, found the legislature quicker to appropriate \$150 million for roads and highways than a tiny fraction of this for retarded children.

One night during the 1953 legislative session, when her retarded-children bill languished in committee, she said to me desperately, "It's easier to get funds for inanimate objects than for human beings. It hardly seems possible that human beings do the voting on these appropriations."

Yet this mental block on the part of legislators may be waning. Under the leadership of an Eagle Congressman from Rhode Island, JOHN E. FOGARTY, Congress has just allocated over \$2 million for programs aimed at rehabilitating retarded children. Another goal of the program is to try to discover why some children have congenital defects which render it difficult for them to lead normal lives. This sum is by far the most generous benefaction ever set aside for such a purpose. In his campaign for the children's funds, Representative FOGARTY had the active and fervent support of a fellow Rhode Island colleague, Congressman AIME J. FORAND. Mr. FORAND is likewise a faithful member of the Eagles.

Slowly but inevitably, Americans are coming to realize that every dollar invested in medical research can be amortized in longer, happier, and healthier lives.

Some of this understanding is due to the leadership of a remarkable and attractive woman named Mary Lasker. She has used the fortune inherited from her late husband to encourage study of the ailments which cripple and kill people. The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation gives substantial awards each year for achievements in the area of psychiatric and medical research. Writers and journalists, for example, are rewarded for outstanding contributions on these topics. Mrs. Lasker also helps to support such projects as the National Mental Health Committee and the New York Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases.

Each of us sees illness only as an isolated occurrence. It may happen to us or to a loved one. This is tragic, but we still do not see how it affects America as a whole. How many realize that mental sickness deprived our Armed Forces of over 2,500,000 young men in the prime of life during World War II? Are we aware that more than half the hospital beds in the United States are required for mentally disturbed men and women, and that even these are not enough? On the Senate floor I pointed out that "almost 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in all our farflung battles over the face of the world. Furthermore, in 1 year cancer killed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who were killed in action throughout 3 years of the war in Korea."

Medical research has begun to unlock some strategic doors. The Salk antipolio vaccine is a sample of what prolonged and well financed medical research can accomplish. The vaccine is not perfect, but it provides children with 70 to 90 percent protection against the crippling havoc of infantile paralysis. We take for granted today such antibiotics as penicillin, streptomycin, terramycin, and aureomycin. All are the products of medical research. They have helped to reduce the death rate from tuberculosis 73 percent, from kidney diseases 60 percent, from pneumonia 43 percent. As a result, the life expectancy of the average American increased from an age of 60 in the year 1937 to 68.8 by 1953. Phenomenal new discoveries with respect to the fat content of diets may contribute toward cutting down fatal heart disease in the decade ahead.

These developments, it seems to me, are overwhelming arguments for vast expenditures in medical research. What can be more important than human happiness and human life? These are geared directly to

good health. For a country spending \$40 billion a year for armaments, there is no sum too high to invest in the well-being of its citizens. I still recall what my wife Maurine said to me when she was fighting for a paltry \$80,000 in the Oregon Legislature, to spend in behalf of retarded little children.

"The beasts of the field on my mother's farm will do anything for their young," she said. "Can we look the next generation of human beings in the face if we have not done everything possible for them in the vital area of sound bodies and medical care?"

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF COVENANT CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the State of Rhode Island we are intensely proud of our religious institutions and our religious freedom. Ours is a State of historic tolerance, a sanctuary for all religions, made so by the settlers, who from the very first, agreed to be bound by their Government only in civil things.

Our charter of 1663 declares that "we hold forth a lively experiment that a most flourishing civil state may stand and be best maintained with full liberty in religious concerns."

In those early days, Cotton Mather, looking through Congregationalist eyes, remarked that Rhode Island colonists "gave one another no disturbance in the exercise of religion. Never was held such a variety of religions," he said, "on so small a spot of ground as have been in that colony."

Almost two and a half centuries after the founding of our colony there came into being the Covenant Congregational Church of Providence. This very week—on Saturday, February 23—that church will celebrate 75 years of distinguished service to its members, to their city, and to their State.

It has always been a church in the heart of Providence—in the heart of the city materially and spiritually. It grew from modest rented quarters at 70 Weybosset Street—a most busy thoroughfare—to its present attractive edifice at Franklin and Hoyle Streets, which is still close to the heartthrob of our bustling city of Providence.

As Rhode Island always had a welcome to the stranger—this church had a special welcome to the newcomer—to the immigrant from Sweden who came to strengthen our land with his skills and to maintain our land through his loyalty which is the proud record of his citizenship.

This early chapter is one of the heartwarming memories as both church and community can look back to the distinctive contributions made to the better being of our city and State by these high-minded and stouthearted additions to the American scene. This is the story of all the membership of Covenant Congregational Church, whether they came from near or afar.

But I am happy to note that singled out for special recognition are those members with 50 or more years of golden service. The program assures us that the pastors of old will be recalled—and their sacrificing wives will be remembered—while the documented past is

only a promise of their dedication to the future, toward the common well-being of our community.

No wonder, then, that all Rhode Island, without distinction of creed, rejoices at the record and extends to Pastor Paul B. Fryhling and through him to every member of the congregation, the felicitations and good wishes of all in the light of their contributions to the greater good of the thriving city of Providence in the tolerant State of Rhode Island.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to rise and say that as a Congregationalist I appreciate the tribute which the Senator from Rhode Island has just paid to the historic church which he has mentioned. I think it is characteristic of the Senator's dedicated State that in this country we are free of religious intolerance. I wish the Senator to know that I am sure Congregationalists generally will be honored by the fact that it was the Senator from Rhode Island who paid this tribute today.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon, and I wish to say that I rejoice in the sentiment he has expressed.

WELCOME EXTENDED TO MONTANA FARMERS' UNION CARAVAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again Montana has sent caravans to Washington to find out how Congress works and, in general, to become more familiar with and better informed about matters affecting their interests and welfare in the Nation's Capital. This year Montana has had 3 caravans comprising approximately 75 persons in each one. These are members of the Farmers' Union, many of whom I have known for years and for whom I have great respect. They have made great contributions to the building up of our State and Nation. I think they are typical of the family-size type farmers and ranchers and I know of their great interest in farm legislation and matters affecting their economy.

It has been both pleasant and worth while for the Montana delegation, headed by our distinguished senior Senator [Mr. MURRAY], Congressmen METCALF, ANDERSON and me, to meet with this and the preceding groups. We have learned much and we are sure that the folks from Montana have benefited as well.

I should like at this time to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the third of this year's Montana caravan delegations representing the Farmers' Union is in the Chamber, and I would ask this group to stand at this time so that they may be recognized.

(The members of the caravan delegation rose, and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, 39 years ago, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed her independence, an independence that was won after more than 100 years of subjugation by the Russian empire. During her brief span of independence, Lithuania's progress in all fields of endeavor—social, cultural, economic, and political—was exemplary, and she took her place among the democratic nations of the world. Unfortunately, after a brief 22 years of independence, from 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was again seized by Soviet Russia. Today there is no independence in Lithuania, no flags are displayed, no anthems are sung. Since 1940 the Lithuanian people have lived a life of uninterrupted horror. No visitors are permitted to enter the country, and no one is permitted to leave. Lithuania itself has become a Soviet concentration camp, its inhabitants the victims of a persecution devoted to the extermination of the last vestiges of Lithuanian national life.

I think it is fitting, on the anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, that we in America once again declare our full support of the Lithuanian people in their fight for freedom.

We are confident that these determined and courageous people, having once known the overwhelming satisfaction of living under a democratically constituted government, and having once known the gratification of freedom of worship, will never give up until their country is delivered from its captivity and can once again take its rightful position among the free nations of the world. The Lithuanian people, through their determination and courage, have set a magnificent example for the Free World. They remind us that we can never rest until freedom is restored to all people now living in Communist captivity.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to Senate Joint Resolution 19, in order to state for the RECORD the reasons why, when it comes to a vote. I shall support the resolution. I do so, Mr. President, at this time because it seems fitting that other and more senior Members of the Senate should have the opportunity to hold the floor as the debate reaches its climax in the days ahead.

Mr. President, I listened with great interest when the President of the United States delivered his special and emergency message on the Middle East to the joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In common, I am sure, with the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in both Houses of Congress, I find myself in substantial agreement with the principle which he enunciated, to the effect that conditions in the Middle East had deteriorated drastically during the past few months and that, despite the rosy picture of conditions in that area which had been painted for the American people during the fall election campaign, the real conditions were, during the past fall, and are today, critical in nature. They are critical particularly because, to my way of thinking, Mr. President, of the ill-advised efforts of our allies, Britain, France, and Israel, to remedy conditions which to them, I am sure, seemed intolerable, by the use of force—force in violation of their obligations to the United Nations.

Mr. President, I was in accord with the action which our country took, through the President, in using the full authority of his office, within the framework of the United Nations, to obtain a withdrawal of the French and British forces, a reopening of the Suez Canal, a withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the Sinai Peninsula and, if she will respect the resolutions of the United Nations, an even further withdrawal.

It seemed to me it was eminently appropriate that, as the President of the United States requested, we should make it clear in no uncertain terms that this country would not permit international communism to move into the Middle East. And so I was predisposed to favor the general policy outlined by the President.

It was therefore with some amazement that I read the original resolution—a joint resolution that would have the force of law—presented by the Secretary of State in alleged compliance with the policy laid down by the President of the United States. Mr. President, with some slight experience as an executive at a very low level in our governmental hierarchy, as mayor of one of our great cities, it has been my observation that when an executive goes to the legislature with a recommended action having such grave consequences as that implicit in the position advanced by the President of the United States in his special message, he has an obligation to the legislative body, through his duly constituted agents—of whom, of course, the principal one in this instance is the Secretary of State—to present to that legislative body not only an overall general policy, but a plan

for implementing it, and a program to carry it out, as well as at least the bare outline of the procedures which will render the policy, plan, and program effective.

Mr. President, the joint resolution submitted to this body and to the House of Representatives by the Secretary of State was none of those things. It was neither policy nor plan nor program nor procedure. The joint resolution is appropriately described in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services as an emergency stopgap. I quote from the report:

The resolution is an emergency stopgap. It is idle to suppose that the actions taken under the authority of this resolution will in themselves bring about peace, security, and stability in the Middle East, and the President recognized this fact in his message to Congress of January 5. But the authority granted by this resolution is essential to provide an atmosphere in which other measures can be brought to bear and to provide time for those other measures to be effective.

The joint committee is concerned that other measures be taken, that they be taken promptly, and that they be adequate to the task. The joint committee expects to be consulted as these measures are developed and applied. But it is not necessary to debate and determine all of these measures in connection with the pending resolution. To do so, indeed, would involve a quite unacceptable degree of delay.

I made it my business to attend as many of the open sessions at which the Secretary of State testified as the pressure of other official business would permit. With the kind permission of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is now occupying the chair, I was permitted to attend one or two of the executive sessions of the joint hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services.

I was distressed to observe during those hearings what seemed to me to be a lack of candor as to the purposes of the resolution on the part of the Secretary of State in testifying before those duly constituted committees, each of which has important constitutional obligations to perform in connection with the foreign relations of our country and the state of its Armed Forces. There was a lack of candor in informing those committees as to just what was behind this stopgap resolution.

There was an effort to persuade those committees—and, indeed, the press and the public at large—that this was more than a mere stopgap resolution to discourage the forces of international communism from moving into the Middle East, while a policy, a plan, and a program—which apparently are not yet in existence—could be worked out.

I congratulate the members of the two committees of the Senate which sat long and patiently hearing not only the Secretary of State, but many other witnesses, for the effective job which has been done in rewriting the joint resolution so that it can be presented to the world, not as a great doctrine, not as something of cosmic importance, but for what it is, as described in the report

which the present occupant of the chair, on behalf of the two committees, submitted to this body, namely, an emergency stopgap.

Because it is an emergency stopgap, and because I believe that each of us, regardless of party, without concern for partisanship, should rally behind the President of the United States in giving unequivocal notice to the forces of international communism that we do not propose to permit them to overrun the Middle East, and that we will give military and economic assistance to the countries of the Middle East which request such assistance and which are prepared to resist the forces of international communism, I shall vote for the joint resolution.

I hope that this debate will stress to the executive department the vital importance of moving ahead to prepare and present to the Congress of the United States, to the people of the United States, to the United Nations, and to the entire free world, a carefully thought out and elaborated plan, policy, program, and procedure for giving effect to the responsibilities of our country in that area of great world crisis.

To digress for only a moment, let me say that it was with pride that I noted the announcement, made on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader, of the position of the policy committee of the party of which I have the honor to belong, in opposition to the imposition of sanctions against Israel.

So long as Russia stands before the world unchastised, and with no sanctions imposed, or even proposed or threatened, for the rape of Hungary; so long as the friendly nation of India—with whom I hope our relationship can grow closer—is permitted to defy the resolutions of the United Nations with respect to Kashmir; and so long as Egypt is permitted to ignore the international obligations with respect to the free passage of the ships of all nations through the Suez Canal, to which free passage Egypt gave her consent in 1950, I hope we shall not take the step, on behalf of the United Nations, of punishing Israel for failing promptly to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations, while other countries are permitted to go their way without the slightest attempt to call a halt by the imposition of sanctions for their defiance of that world body.

I hope the joint resolution will pass by a very large majority. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will propose certain amendments to the joint resolution in the course of the next few days. I know that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has already filed an amendment to the joint resolution which he proposes to present in due course.

In stating my approval of Senate Joint Resolution 19, as amended, I would not want it to be thought that I shall not give careful consideration to supporting the amendments to which I have referred, because in my judgment they might well strengthen the joint resolution as it is presently drafted.

I am particularly disappointed that we were unable to persuade the President and the Secretary of State to be satisfied with a simple resolution expressing the sense of the Senate, as opposed to a joint resolution said to have the force of law. But I reiterate that I hope the joint resolution, when it comes to a final vote, will receive overwhelming endorsement from Members of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment and commend the Senator from Pennsylvania on the speech he has just made. He has enunciated a sound aspect in his understanding of our foreign policy. I know that the Eisenhower joint resolution, as originally introduced, disturbed the Senator a great deal. I am happy to note that in the resolution as reported by the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GREEN], one of the main worries of the Senator from Pennsylvania, namely, the question of constitutional authority, has been relieved by amending the resolution to such an extent that there is now a clear delineation between the constitutional power of the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the power of Congress, constitutionally speaking, to declare war. Again I congratulate and commend the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF DATE FOR FILING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the Chair inform me if Senate Resolution 99, to extend the date for the filing of a report on the investigation of matters pertaining to technical assistance and related matters, was acted on by the Senate today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution was agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS AGAINST ISRAEL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this morning, at the White House, a conference was held by the President of the United States with the bipartisan leadership. At that time I made a proposal of a possible alternative to the application of sanctions against Israel. I had not intended to make the proposed alternative public at this time. However, as sometimes happens at a meeting so large as that one, the wire services received information that such a proposal had been made; and they had some accurate information and some information which was slightly garbled, to say the least.

In view of that circumstance, Mr. President, I determined that I would make available the text of the proposed alternative, which was submitted only as a basis for consideration. It is not claimed that it is the only alternative; neither is it claimed that it is necessarily the best alternative. However, when matters of such moment are being considered, I believe it is only fair that those who have objection to a particular course of action should present what they, at least, believe to be a constructive alternative. It is only on that basis that I present the following:

The proposal for consideration was that in the United Nations General Assembly, when it meets tomorrow, the United States Government sponsor a resolution which would:

First. State that all member states have an obligation to comply with their charter obligations, to refrain from aggression and to respect the resolutions of the General Assembly.

Second. Make clear that failure by an aggressor state to comply with the resolution of the United Nations would properly subject the offending state, large or small, to the condemnation of the law-abiding nations of the world; and if persisted in 30 days after the Secretary General has reported noncompliance, it is recommended that economic, diplomatic, and moral sanctions be applied against such offending state or states by the members of the United Nations.

Third. Provide that the General Assembly declare that all Israeli troops should be withdrawn from Aqaba and the Gaza Strip, and these areas to be occupied and administered by the United Nations until, (a) a majority of the members of the General Assembly determine that international peace and order would be served by their withdrawal, or, (b) a treaty of peace is entered into between Egypt and Israel, whichever is sooner.

Fourth. Recommend the establishment of a neutral belt between Israel and the neighboring states with whom an armistice is now in force, this neutral zone to be policed by the United Nations emergency force until the armistice has been supplanted by a treaty of peace between said nations.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM— ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no Senator desires to address

the Senate at this time, I am prepared to move that the Senate take a recess or adjourn until tomorrow.

For the information of all Senators, I should like to point out that on Friday, no business will be transacted which will require the taking of votes. I am hopeful that any Senator who may desire to speak will avail himself of that opportunity on tomorrow; and that if at that time no Senator desires to speak, the Presiding Officer will have the joint resolution read the third time, and then will put the question on its passage. I am hopeful that it will not be necessary to have the Senate take a recess or adjourn in the middle of the day, when there are still dozens of Senators who desire to discuss the pending question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I did earlier in the day, I wish to concur in the viewpoint expressed by the majority leader. As I pointed out earlier, I have asked the members of our staff to contact the Senators on this side of the aisle, to point out again to them that the joint resolution on the Middle East situation is before the Senate, and to inquire whether they contemplate making any speeches on it; and also to point out that today, tomorrow, and Friday will all be available to them, and that we hope they will make every effort to make their speeches this week, so that we can move into the voting stages of the joint resolution as early next week as the Senate determines and as is convenient to the Members.

I wish to concur in the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, and to join him in a bipartisan spirit in asking that all Members take advantage of the time which now is available, before we might enter a period in which the time would be limited, in the event the Senate determined to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the statement the distinguished minority leader has made.

Mr. President, I desire to repeat that I am prepared to vote on the joint resolution at any time. If, on tomorrow, no Senator wishes to speak on the joint resolution, we shall proceed to act upon it.

Many Senators have told me that they expect to address themselves to this subject, some of them at length. But for 2 days, now, there have been times when it has been necessary to have quorum calls in order to summon Senators to the Chamber. Although I do not wish to appear to be lecturing my colleagues, I do desire to place them on notice, and to be sure that they have the information. For that purpose, I have made twice before today the statement which I have just repeated.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 21, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20 (legislative day, February 18), 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Murray Snyder, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Dewey Short, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Chester R. Davis, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Coral Donzel Payne, Protestant chaplain, House of God, Mooseheart, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, with whom no one is great, no one is low, but all are equal and near, we thank Thee that Thou dost own us, and claim us as Thy children.

Day by day, life's duties place upon us their obligations.

The hours are filled with much serving, but at this moment we own one right.

We worship Thee. We bless Thee. We thank Thee for Thy goodness and Thy grace.

Thou findest us wherever we are. Thou knowest us whatever we do.

Thou art our comfort even when we feel lost and alone.

Thou readest our hearts correctly.

Let no sufferer believe that he suffers alone.

Let no sinner think that he bears the consequences of his deeds alone.

Let no neglected one decide that he is unwanted by Thee.

In this hostile world, we thank Thee for this body of men who have dedicated their talents to the building and maintaining a strong and free nation; but in doing so,

May we ever be mindful, that it is possible to build a nation of scientific giants and spiritual morons.

Give to us wisdom and endow us with patience, that we may train the youth of our country, so that they may become morally and spiritually capable of controlling the forces we discover.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President had made the following appointments:

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. POTTER, and Mr. MORTON.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. JAVITS.

To the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy: Mr. KUCHEL.